

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the Organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October, the last issue being a double number; the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

F. W. HALL, M.A., St. John's College, Oxford.
R. HACKFORTH, M.A., Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

RBA

Board of Management:

PROF. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

PROF. A. G. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Treasurer.

L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

PROF. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., F.B.A. { With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

B. A. BARBER, M.A. Representing the Oxford Philological Society.

PROF. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago;
Prof. MAURICE HUTTON, Toronto; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., Melbourne.

Vol. XXII.

JULY-OCTOBER, 1928

Nos. 3, 4

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE <i>PARMENIDES</i> OF PLATO AND THE ORIGIN OF THE NEOPLATONIC 'ONE'	E. R. DODDS
THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH PLATONIC EPISTLES	J. HARWARD
THE OFFERINGS OF THE HYPERBOREANS	C. T. SELTMAN
ALEXANDER OF ABONUTEICHOS	A. D. NOCK
THE PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN PROBLEMS: THEIR NATURE AND COMPOSITION	E. S. FORSTER
THE <i>HISTORIA AUGUSTA</i> : ITS DATE AND PURPOSE	NORMAN H. BAYNES
TACITUS, <i>HISTORIES</i> I. 13	H. C. NUTTING
ZU P. OXY. III. 414	S. LURIA
SOPHOCLES' <i>ANTIGONE</i>	A. C. PEARSON
MARTIAL V. xvii. 4	W. M. LINDSAY
MARCH 1, 50 B.C.	C. G. STONE
HANDS AND SCRIBES	E. LOBEL
MISCELLANEA	T. W. ALLEN
KARL MARX ON GREEK ATOMISM	CYRIL BAILEY
ΟΥΔΑΝ ΚΕΚΑΗΓΟΝΤΕΣ	R. MCKENZIE
AQUILLO, THE BLACK WIND	R. MCKENZIE
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	208
INDICES	215

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price for single numbers, 4/- net, or 4/2 post free. Yearly Subscription 16/- post free; U.S.A. \$4.
Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 26/- post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. F. H. Sandbach, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. A. Pitman, 4, Prince's Buildings, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. K. Wakefield, Maidstone Girls' Grammar School, Kent; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaußen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. G. W. Dyson, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies.

Annual Subscription · ONE GUINEA.

Entrance Fee · ONE GUINEA.

PRESIDENT—WALTER LEAF, Esq., LITT.D., D.LITT.

OBJECTS.—The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies was founded in 1879 for the following objects:—

I.—To advance the study of Greek language, literature, and art, and to illustrate the history of the Greek race in the ancient, Byzantine, and Neo-Hellenic periods, by the publication of memoirs and unedited documents or monuments in a Journal to be issued periodically.

II.—To collect drawings, facsimiles, transcripts, plans, and photographs of Greek inscriptions, MSS., works of art, ancient sites and remains, and with this view to invite travellers to communicate to the Society notes or sketches of archaeological and topographical interest.

To organize means by which members of the Society may have increased facilities for visiting ancient sites and pursuing archaeological researches in countries which, at any time, have been the sites of Hellenic civilization.

Application for membership, or for information about the Society, should be addressed to the Secretary, at 19 Bloomsbury Square, W.C. 1.

The Journal of Hellenic Studies and other publications of the Society are issued by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., Ltd., and can be purchased from any bookseller, the published price to non-members being 30s. net per volume or 15s. net each part. Members are entitled to receive a copy of the *Journal* on publication during their membership, and can purchase back volumes at the subscription rate of 21s. per annum.

Members also have the use of a well-equipped library at 19 Bloomsbury Square and of a large collection of lantern-slides illustrative of Classical Studies.

ent and
ss upon
ational
; (c) to
create

annual
e of 5s.
ceedings
Classical
Classical
before
e must

to the
either
Road,
cretary
iversity,
gham;
iversity
r. Basil
; Miss
nshaw,
; Mrs.
. D. T.
ollege,
t; Mr.
escent,
etcher,
l; and

ies.
UINEA.

for the

history
lication
odically.
criptions,
ellers to
raphical

visiting
y time,

d to the

Messrs.
members
y of the
cription

a large

T

TH

genti
there
preve
The
vitiat
The
necess
To 1
centu
chron
of th
devel
Scali
tury
that
Wher
expla
plat
geog
Egypt
orient
Few
the e
affirm

Euna
(thou
he w
attra

¹ Cf
Theolog
² Po
διηγείσ
τῆς τω
twice
whose
Since
priest
certain

NO

THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JULY-OCTOBER, 1928.

THE PARMENIDES OF PLATO AND THE ORIGIN OF THE NEOPLATONIC 'ONE.'

THE last phase of Greek philosophy has until recently been less intelligently studied than any other, and in our understanding of its development there are still lamentable *lacunae*. Three errors in particular have in the past prevented a proper appreciation of Plotinus' place in the history of philosophy. The first was the failure to distinguish Neoplatonism from Platonism: this vitiates the work of many early exponents from Ficinus down to Kirchner. The second was the belief that the Neoplatonists, being 'mystics,' were necessarily incomprehensible to the plain man or even to the plain philosopher. To have encouraged the persistence of this superstition in the nineteenth century is the least pardonable of Creuzer's many sins. The third was the chronological confusion involved in the ascription to Saint Paul's contemporary of the works of the pretended *Dionysius Areopagita*, which contain a fully-developed Neoplatonic theology. Though the fraud had been exposed by Scaliger, these writings continued down to the beginning of the nineteenth century (and in certain clerical circles down to our own day¹) to be used as evidence that the 'Neoplatonic trinity' was an inferior imitation of the Christian one. When this false trail was at length abandoned the fashion for orientalizing explanations persisted in another guise: to the earliest historians of Neoplatonism, Simon and Vacherot, the school of Plotinus was (in defiance of geographical facts) 'the school of Alexandria,' and its inspiration was mainly Egyptian. Vacherot says of Neoplatonism that it is 'essentially and radically oriental, having nothing of Greek thought but its language and procedure.' Few would be found to-day to subscribe to so sweeping a pronouncement; but the existence of an important oriental element in Plotinus' thought is still affirmed by many French and German writers.

This is 'proved' in two ways: In the first place, Plotinus is said by Eunapius and other late authorities after him to have been born in Egypt (though Porphyry knows nothing of this²); we do know from Porphyry that he was a student at Alexandria, whose fame as a centre of Greek learning attracted young men from all parts of the world; that he joined Gordian's

¹ Cf. e.g. *Jahrbuch für Philosophie u. Spekulative Theologie*, XII. 483-94; XIII. 82-106.

² Porph. *Vit. Plot.* 1: οὐτε περὶ τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ διηγεῖσθαι ἡρέχθετο οὐτε περὶ τῶν γονέων οὐτε περὶ τῆς πατρόδοσης. Further on (*ibid.*, 10) Porphyry twice designates as τὸν Ἀλγύπτιον the priest in whose company Plotinus visited the Iseum. Since this description serves to distinguish the priest from Plotinus, we may infer that Porphyry certainly did not regard his master as an Egyptian

by blood, and probably did not think of him as an Egyptian in any sense. In face of this negative testimony of his closest disciple, how much weight are we justified in attaching to the evidence of a hagiographer like Eunapius, who was not born until three-quarters of a century after Plotinus' death? Under the influence of the fourth-century belief in Egypt as the home of all wisdom, and in the absence of all positive information to the contrary, nothing could be

expedition to the East with a view to studying the philosophy of Persia and India, but failed to get there; and that on one occasion he accepted the invitation of an Egyptian priest to take part in a spiritualistic seance arranged by the priest at the Iseum in Rome.¹ Add to this the fact that in one passage, dealing with the theory of Beauty,² he expresses his admiration of the Egyptian hieroglyphs; and that (like Plato) he compares philosophy to an initiation into the mysteries—perhaps in his case the Isiac mysteries,³ and perhaps not. Even so might an Englishman, educated and perhaps born in India, take advantage of a punitive expedition to study comparative religion on the North-West Frontier, and of an invitation to a Tantrist temple to see something of Indian devil-worship; he might even praise the sacred sculpture of Benares, and adorn his style with occasional allusions to the car of Juggernaut. We know with certainty that Plotinus' name is Roman, and that he wrote the idiomatic Greek of a native speaker; he *may* have been an expert in Egyptian religion, but all that he tells us on the subject could have been picked up on a Cook's tour.

The second method of proof is much simpler, since it rests entirely on negative evidence. Certain thoughts and points of view are shared by Plotinus with earlier writers who have been given their passports as 'true Greeks'; these are deducted from the sum total of Plotinus' system, and the *residuum* is labelled 'oriental.' Three assumptions are involved in this labelling: That the labeller has a safe criterion for distinguishing the 'true Greeks' from the half-breeds among Plotinus' predecessors; that he is intimately familiar with the whole of 'true Greek' literature, both with what has survived and with what has not; and, lastly, that Plotinus never invented anything for himself, but composed his works by copying out passages from 'authorities.' Clearly these are large assumptions. If we are to avoid making them, we must find convincing parallels between specific passages in Plotinus and specific passages of non-Hellenized oriental religious literature. Perhaps the orientalists will one day help us there. Until such parallels are forthcoming⁴ it seems to me wisest to maintain a position of *époxy* on the whole question, and in the meantime see what can be made of possible sources nearer home.

more natural than that the fact of Plotinus' early studies at Alexandria should give rise to the legend of his Egyptian birth. The value of the further statement that he was born at Lyco seemed doubtful even to Eunapius (Αὐκώ ταύτην ὄνομάσσωντι· καίτοι γε ὁ θεοπέποντος φίλος πορφύριος τούτο οὐκ ἀνέγραψε, μαθητής τε αὐτοῦ γεγενήσας λέγων, καὶ συνερχολακέναι τὸν βίον ἀπαρταὶ τὸν πλείστον τούτον [actually only for six years], *Vit. phil.* 455).

¹ *Ibid.* 3 and 10.

² *Enn.* V. viii. 6.

³ J. Cochez (in *Rev. Néo-Scolastique* XVIII. [1911] 328-40, and *Mélanges d'Histoire Offerts à Ch. Moeller I.* 85-101) claims to have proved this. He is followed by F. Cumont in *Monuments Piot* XXV. 77 sqq.; but the weakness of their case has been effectively exposed by Erik Peter-

son in his review of Cumont's paper, *Theol. Literaturzeitung* (1925), No. 21, 485-7. In this connexion Mr. A. D. Nock has called my attention to Theo Smyrn. *Expos. rev. math.* 14. 18 sqq., Hiller, where an elaborate parallelism between the Platonic philosophy and the mysteries is built on Plato, *Phd.* 69D and *Phdr.* 250C. Such metaphors are common from Plato onwards: e.g. Chrysippus calls discourses about the gods *τελεταί* (*Vet. St. Fr.* II, 1008, Arnim).

⁴ Up to the present we seem to have little or no evidence that before they were touched to intellectual life by contact with Greek culture the peoples of the Near East achieved anything deserving the name of abstract thought; their thinking hardly existed outside the myths which embodied it (see Th. Hopfner, *Orient u. Griechische*

This was in substance the advice of Zeller, who called attention to the existence of such sources in Stoicism, Neopythagoreanism, and Middle Platonism. They are scattered and for the most part fragmentary. In the last fifty years German scholars like Schmekel and Praechter have done a good deal to illuminate them and bind them together; but easily the most important contribution to the question since Zeller is contained in Werner Jaeger's brilliantly written book *Nemesios von Emesa*—a book which has not yet received in this country the attention it merits, perhaps because it was published on the eve of the war. Jaeger shows, in my judgment convincingly, that some characteristic Neoplatonic doctrines, in particular the notion of *σύνδεσμος*—the universe as a spiritual *continuum* extending through a definite series of *media* from the supreme God to bare Matter—go back to the Platonizing Stoic source which the Germans have agreed to call Poseidonius. Jaeger indeed would be more precise, and say that most of them went back to Poseidonius' commentary on the *Timaeus*—the epoch-making commentary thanks to which, he tells us, the Plato of the *Timaeus* is the Plato of Neoplatonism and of the Renaissance. He concludes that Poseidonius was the true father of Neoplatonism; had but Poseidonius found a place for the Platonic Ideas there would have been nothing left for Plotinus to do!¹

It is apparent that Jaeger has here allowed his discovery to carry him too fast and too far. Poseidonius left out something far more essential to Neoplatonism than the Ideas (which Plotinus might at a pinch have dispensed with had he not found them in Plato): Poseidonius left out the One. If there is one doctrine more than another which the tradition justifies our accepting as *echt-Poseidonisches* it is his definition of God as 'a fiery breath which thinks' (*πνεῦμα νοερὸν καὶ πυρώδες*²), which has no shape of its own, but changes into what it chooses and assimilates itself to all things. Poseidonius' highest principle is thus material, immanent (though in varying grades of immanence), and of the same stuff as the human intellect. *But* the Plotinian doctrine of an undifferentiated ground of all existence, transcending not only Matter but Mind, creative without will or causality, unknowable save in the *unio mystica*, having no character save the character of being a ground—this is the part of Plotinus' system which has at all times impressed itself most deeply on his readers.³

It is also—and very surprisingly, I think—the part which historians have found most difficulty in accounting for. Zeller called it 'a dialectical development from Stoicism,'⁴ and asserted that it appeared first in Plotinus;⁵ Monrad found it 'oriental' in contrast with the *echt hellenischen* doctrine of *νοῦς*;⁶ Vacherot, Guyot, and others derive it from Philo, despite the profound differences of the two systems.⁷ The result is that the Plotinian One is the product of a synthesis of elements derived from Greek philosophy and from oriental myth-making.

¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 70.

² Stob. [Aetius] *Ecl. I. 2. 29* [58H].

³ Phil. der Griech. III³. 427.

⁴ *Ibid.* 435.

⁵ *Philos. Monatsheft* XXIV. (1888), p. 186.

ence in point of view between Philo and Plotinus, and despite the fact that Philo repeatedly calls his God *όν* and *νοῦς*.¹ Some have thought of Numenius or Alcinous (whom we are now taught to call Albinus); but the God of both these writers remains a superior *νοῦς*,² and neither of them speaks of him as the One.³ Others, more reasonably, have been reminded of the One and the Indeterminate Dyad in some Neopythagoreans and in Aristotle's version of Plato's metaphysic. But, oddly enough, apart from a passing reference in Whittaker's book all the professed historians of Neoplatonism whom I have read ignore for some reason the obvious Platonic source.

Think of a principle of unity which so completely transcends all plurality that it refuses every predicate, even that of existence; which is neither in motion nor at rest, neither in time nor in space; of which we can say nothing, not even that it is identical with itself or different from other things: and side by side with this, a second principle of unity, containing the seeds of all the contraries—a principle which, if we once grant it existence, proceeds to pluralize itself indefinitely in a universe of existent unities. If for the moment we leave fragments out of account and consider only the extant works of Greek philosophers before the age of Plotinus, there is one passage, and so far as I know one passage only, where these thoughts receive connected expression—namely, the first and second 'hypotheses' in the second part of Plato's *Parmenides*. Plotinus ignored one or two of the more fanciful conclusions reached in these hypotheses; and to some of those which he adopted he gave a new turn. But how close is the parallelism at many points may be judged from a comparison of the following passages:

PLATO, *Parmenides*.

First Hypothesis.

(a) ἀπειρον ἄρα τὸ ἐν . . . καὶ ἀνεν σχήματος ἄρα . . . ἐπέιπερ οὐδὲ μέρη ἔχει. (137D-E.)
 (b) τοιοῦτον γε ὁν (τὸ ἐν) οὐδαμοῦ ἀν εἰν· οὐτε γάρ ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐτε ἐν ἑαυτῷ εἴη. (138A.)
 (c) τὸ ἐν ἄρα, ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐτε ἔστηκεν οὐτε κινεῖται. (139B.)

PLOTINUS.

(a) οὐτ' οὐν πρὸς ἄλλο οὐτε πρὸς αὐτὸν πεπέρανται (τὸ ἐν) . . . οὐδὲ σχῆμα τοίνυν, οὐτε μηδὲ μέρη. (V. v. II.)
 (b) οὐκ ἐν ὅτῳδιν ἄρα (τὸ ἐν)· ταύτη οὐν οὐδαμοῦ. (V. v. 9.)
 (c) οὐδὲ κινούμενον οὐδ' αὐτὸν εἰστά (ἔστι τὸ ἐν). (VI. ix. 3.)

¹ The Neopythagorean identification of God with the supreme monad is mentioned by Philo only to be amended: τέτακται οὐν ὁ θεὸς κατὰ τὸ ἐν καὶ τὴν μονάδα, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡ μονάς κατὰ τὸν ἑνα θεόν· τὰς γὰρ ἀριθμὸς νεώτερος κόσμον, ὡς καὶ χρόνος, ὁ δὲ θεὸς πρεσβύτερος κόσμον καὶ δημιουργός (Leg. Alleg. II. 1, 3). So also Clement of Alexandria, *Pred* I. 8. 71, tells us that God is *ἐν* [not *τὸ* *ἐν*] καὶ ἐπέκεντα τοῦ ἐνὸς καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτὴν μονάδα. Both Philo and Clement were of course deeply influenced by Neopythagorean speculation, of which Alexandria had long been a centre; but in this matter they were determined to go one better than the heathen. Philo's god must similarly be *κρείττων* ἢ αὐτὸς τὸ ἀγαθόν (*De opif.*

mundi 2, 8), although in the same breath he is identified with *νοῦς*; and *τὸ* *όν* must be ἀγαθὸν *κρείττων* καὶ ἐνὸς εἰλικρινέστερον καὶ μονάδος ἀρχηγούντερον (*Vit. contemp*. I. 2; cf. *Praem. et poen.* 6, 40). Any attempt to extract a coherent system from Philo seems to me foredoomed to failure; his eclecticism is that of the jackdaw rather than the philosopher.

² Numenius *ap.* Euseb. *Prep. Ev.* XI. 22; Alcinous (Albinus), *Didascalicus*, c. 10.

³ Some MSS. of Eusebius do make Numenius speak once of *τὸ* *ἐν* (*loc. cit.*, ἐκμελεγῆσαι μάθημα, τὶ ἔστι τὸ *όν*). But the reading *τὸ* *όν* has better authority, and is supported by Plato, *Rep.* 524E-525A.

(d)
 ἀν αἰν

(e)
 ἐτέρῳ
 (f)
 πολλα
 αὐτὸν
 ἔσται
 ἐλαττο

(g)
 εἶναι τ
 (h)

(i)
 δοξάζει
 αὐτοῦ

(j)
 νενέμη

(144B.)

(k)

(145A.)

(l)

τον ὅν

(m)

καὶ κιν

(n)
 καὶ ἔτε
 ταῦτόν

S
 impro
 Parm
 salvat
 system
 Plotin
 Megan
 exposi

¹ Cf.

² V. i

PLATO, *Parmenides*.

(d) οὐτῷ δὴ ἔτερόν γε ἡ ταῦτα τὸ ἐν οὐτῷ ἀντῷ οὐτῷ ἀντέρῳ εἴη. (139E.)

(e) οὐτε ἄρα ὅμοιον οὐτε ἀνόμοιον οὐθὲ ἔτέρῳ οὐτε ἔαντῳ ἀν εἴη τὸ ἐν. (140B.)

(f) οὐτε ἄρα ἐνὸς μέτρου μετέχον οὐτε πολλῶν οὐτε ὀλίγων, οὐτε τὸ παράπαν τοῦ αὐτοῦ μετέχον, οὐτε ἔαντῳ ποτε, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἔσται ἵνοι οὐτε ἀλλωθεν οὐτε αὖ μεῖζον οὐδὲ ἔλαττον οὐτε ἔαυτοῦ οὐτε ἔτέρουν. (140D.)

(g) οὐδὲ ἐν χρόνῳ τὸ παράπαν δύνατο ἀν εἶναι τὸ ἐν. (141A.)

(h) τὸ ἐν οὐτε ἐν ἔστιν οὐτε ἔστιν. (141E.)

(i) οὐδὲ ὄνομάζεται ἄρα οὐδὲ λέγεται οὐδὲ δοξάζεται οὐδὲ γιγνώσκεται, οὐδὲ τι τῶν ὄντων αὐτοῦ αἰσθάνεται. (142A.)

Second Hypothesis.

(j) ἐπὶ πάντα ἄρα πολλὰ ὄντα ἡ οὐσία νενέμηται καὶ οὐδενὸς ἀποστατεῖ¹ τῶν ὄντων. (144B.)

(k) τὸ ἐν ἄρα ὃν ἐν τέ ἔστι πον καὶ πολλά. (145A.)

(l) καὶ σχήματος δὴ τίνος, ὡς ἔοικε, τοιούτον ὃν μετέχοι ἀν τὸ ἐν. (145B.)

(m) οὐτῷ δὴ πεφυκός τὸ ἐν ἄρού οὐκ ἀνάγκη καὶ κινεῖσθαι καὶ ἔσταναι; (145E.)

(n) καὶ μὴν ταῦτόν γε δεῖ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἔαντῷ καὶ ἔτερον ἔαντοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀλλοις ὡσαύτως ταῦτόν τε καὶ ἔτερον εἶναι. (146A.)

PLOTINUS.

(d) δεῖ μὲν γάρ τι πρὸ πάντων εἶναι ἀπλοῦν τοῦτο καὶ πάντων ἔτερον τῶν μετ' αὐτῷ, ἐφ' ἔαυτοῦ ὃν, οὐ μεμιγμένον τοῖς ἀπ' αὐτοῦ· καὶ πάλιν ἔτερον τρόπον τοῖς ἄλλοις παρείναι δυνάμενον· ὃν ὄντως ἐν, οὐχ ἔτερον ὃν εἶτα ἐν· καθ' οὐδὲνδος καὶ τὸ ἐν εἶναι. (V. iv. 1.)

(e) οὐ γὰρ ἔνι οὐδὲ τὸ οἷον (τῷ ἐνι), ὅτῳ μηδὲ τὸ τι. (V. v. 6.)

(f) οὐ γὰρ θέλει (τὸ ἐν) μετ' ἄλλου οὐτε ἐνὸς οὐτε ὅποσονοῦν συναριθμεῖσθαι, οὐδὲ δλως ἀριθμεῖσθαι· μέτρον γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ οὐ μετρούμενον. (V. v. 4.)

(g) οὐκ ἐν χρόνῳ (ἔστι τὸ ἐν). (VI. ix. 3.)

(h) (τὸ ἐν) καθ' οὐδὲν δοῦσθαι καὶ τὸ ἐν εἶναι. (V. iv. 1.)

ἔστι δὲ οὐδὲ τὸ ἔστιν (κατὰ τοῦ ἐνός). (VI. vii. 38.)

(i) οὐτε τὶ τῶν πάντων (ἔστι τὸ ἐν) οὐτε ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, ὅτι μηδὲν κατ' αὐτοῦ. (V. iii. 13.)

οὐ μὴν αὐτὸν λέγομεν, οὐδὲ γνῶσιν οὐδὲ νόησιν ἔχομεν αὐτοῦ. (Ibid. 14.)

(j) νομιστέον . . . εἶναι . . . πανταχοῦ τοῦ ὄντος τὸ ὃν οὐκ ἀπολειπόμενον ἔαντοῦ. (VI. iv. 11.)

(k) πολλὰ δεῖ τοῦτο τὸ ἐν εἶναι, ὃν μετὰ τὸ πάντη ἐν. (VI. vii. 8.)

(l) σχημάτων δὴ πάντων ὁφθέντων ἐν τῷ ὄντι καὶ ποιότητος ἀπάστης. (VI. ii. 21.)

(m) περὶ μὲν τὸ ὃν τούτων (sc. στάσεως καὶ κινήσεως) θάτερον ἡ ἀμφότερα ἀνάγκη. (VI. ix. 3.)

(n) εἰ δὲ πολλά (ἔστι τὸ ὃν), καὶ ἔτερότης (ἔστι). καὶ εἰ ἐν πολλά, καὶ ταυτότης. (VI. ii. 15.)

Small wonder that Plotinus² regarded the Platonic *Parmenides* as a great improvement on his historical prototype; that Iamblichus³ considered the *Parmenides* and the *Timaeus* as the only Platonic dialogues indispensable to salvation; that Proclus⁴ found in the *Parmenides*, and there only, the complete system of Platonic theology. Read the second part of the *Parmenides* as Plotinus read it, with the single eye of faith; do not look for satire on the Megarians or on anybody else; and you will find in the first hypothesis a lucid exposition of the famous 'negative theology,' and in the second (especially if

¹ Cf. *Enn.* V. v. 9, οὐδενὸς ἀν ἀποστατοῦ (τὸ τι).

² V. i. 8 fin.

³ Procl. in *Tim.* I. 13. 15 sq., Diehl; *Prolig.* *Plat. Phil.* 26.

⁴ *Theol. Plat.* I. 7.

you take it in connexion with the fourth) an interesting sketch of the derivation of a universe from the marriage of unity and existence. What you will find in the remaining hypotheses I cannot so easily predict; even within the Neoplatonic school there were violent differences of opinion about them¹—differences which I must not attempt to discuss here, as they would carry me too far from the main intention of this paper.

Even as regards the first two hypotheses, it is no part of my purpose to argue that the Neoplatonic valuation is an entirely just one; Parmenides' description of his own performance as *γυμνασία* and *παιδιά*,² taken in conjunction with the obvious fallacies in which some of the hypotheses abound, should be sufficient to warn us against assuming that all his conclusions *necessarily* found a place in Plato's own system. At the same time, it should not be forgotten that the Idea of the Good, no less than the 'One' of the first hypothesis, is beyond Being, and that, if we are to believe Aristoxenus,³ the principal conclusion reached in the Lecture on the Good was *ἀγαθόν ἐστιν εὖ*. Moreover, some of the most important discoveries of the later Platonic logic, especially the distinction between absolute and relative non-Being, appear first in the Parmenidean hypotheses—surely an odd way to publish them, if these speculations are pure fun. However that may be, I have difficulty in understanding the present position of so distinguished a scholar as Professor A. E. Taylor, who, when he meets with the negative theology in Proclus or the schoolmen,⁴ takes it seriously as a necessary and salutary 'moment' of religious experience, but when he meets it in the *Parmenides*, describes it as 'a highly-enjoyable philosophical jest'.⁵ Professor Taylor cannot well have it both ways: what is sauce for all the little Neoplatonic and medieval geese should also be sauce for their parent, the great Platonic gander.

But is Plato indeed the parent, or only the putative father of these theological bantlings? It may be urged that the Plotinian interpretation of the *Parmenides* is a complete misunderstanding; that important philosophies are not built solely on the misunderstanding of other philosophies, or, if they are, the misunderstanding is not accidental; that the Neoplatonists notoriously found in Plato whatever they wished to find ('Hic liber est in quo quaerit sua dogmata quisque'); and that, in fine, the Neoplatonic interpretation of the *Parmenides* is subsequent to the rise of Neoplatonism, not prior to it—an effect and not a cause.

Now it is of course true that when, for example, Proclus finds his *ἀχραντοί θεοί* darkly revealed in the *Parmenides*, he is reading into Plato a dogma originally constructed out of hints in the so-called *Chaldaic Oracles*. But this is hardly relevant to the question at issue. For, in the first place, the systematic allegorization of Plato, which enabled Proclus to bring the teachings of that philosopher into complete harmony with the Orphic and Chaldaic

¹ See Proclus in *Parm.* 1052-64, Cousin.

1091b 13.

² 135C sqq.; 137B.

⁴ Proc. Arist. Soc., N.S. XVIII., p. 632.

³ Harm. El. II., p. 30, Meib.; cf. Ar. *Metaph.*

⁵ Plato: *The Man and his Work*, p. 370.

derivation will find in the Neoplatonism¹—differ-
rally me too
purpose to Parmenides' in conjunc-
nd, should necessarily
ould not be first hypo-
e principal ν . More-
ppar first
n, if these
in under-
ssor A. E.
lus or the
f religious
a highly-
oth ways:
ld also be
er of these
etation of
ilosophies
or, if they
otoriously
quaerit sua
on of the
—an effect
āχραντοι
a dogma
But this
place, the
teachings
Chaldaic

theology, appears to be mainly, if not entirely, the invention of Iamblichus:² there is very little of the kind in Plotinus. Secondly, the Neoplatonic interpretation of Plato's $\tau\circ\ \bar{\epsilon}\nu$ and $\tau\circ\ \bar{\epsilon}\nu\ \bar{\delta}\nu$ rests on a literal, not an allegorical understanding of the text, and has commended itself to some able modern critics who are certainly not Neoplatonists.³ Thirdly, this interpretation is, in fact, older than Plotinus. It seems worth while to develop this last consideration at some length, not only because it is the decisive one for my immediate argument, but because in tracing back the history of the Neoplatonic interpretation we are at the same time retracing one of the main currents of thought which traverse earlier Greek philosophy and issue in Neoplatonism.

Plotinus will not help us in this enquiry: he is too much interested in his own views to trouble about recording other people's. The commentaries which Porphyry (?), Castricius Firmus (?), Iamblichus, Plutarchus the son of Nestorius, and Syrianus devoted to the *Parmenides* are lost. Our first resort is therefore Proclus. Proclus distinguishes three schools of interpretation of the second part of the *Parmenides*. The first saw in it either a polemic against Zeno or a logical exercise; the second took it seriously, but did not find in it $\tau\circ\ \bar{\alpha}\pi\bar{\rho}\bar{\rho}\bar{\eta}\bar{\tau}\bar{\circ}\bar{r}\bar{e}\bar{p}\bar{a}\ \tau\bar{a}\bar{w}\bar{\nu}\ \bar{\delta}\bar{o}\bar{y}\bar{m}\bar{a}\bar{t}\bar{a}\bar{w}\bar{\nu}$:⁴ for them the kernel of the dialogue was the doctrine of the $\bar{\epsilon}\nu\ \bar{\delta}\nu$, which embraces the Ideas in its unity. The third school are distinguished from the others in that they agree in referring the first hypothesis to the $\bar{\iota}\bar{p}\bar{e}\bar{o}\bar{u}\bar{\nu}\bar{s}\bar{i}\bar{o}\bar{v}\bar{\nu}$; most of them refer the second hypothesis to $\nu\bar{o}\bar{v}\bar{s}$, and the third to $\psi\bar{u}\bar{x}\bar{h}\bar{\jmath}$, but here agreement ends. Unfortunately no names are attached to the first two schools. The first view (which is also that of many modern scholars) is implied in Albinus,⁵ and is doubtless much older than Albinus: we may plausibly ascribe it to the sceptical New Academy. The second or immanentist interpretation (which is much like that formerly held by Professor Taylor,⁶ but now abandoned by him) suggests Stoic influence, and we may perhaps think of Antiochus of Ascalon as its possible originator. The third is clearly the Neoplatonic view. In its primitive form Proclus associates it with the name of Plotinus. For evidence of an earlier origin we must turn to another quarter.

Sextus Empiricus⁷ tells us that while some Neopythagoreans derived the material universe from the effluxion of the point, others derived it from *two* $\bar{\alpha}\bar{p}\bar{\chi}\bar{a}\bar{l}\bar{i}$, the One and the Indeterminate Dyad. On the basis of this, Schmekel⁸ and others after him distinguish a monistic and a dualistic school of Neopythagoreanism. But the distinction in this form does not really hold: for some at least of the so-called dualists posited an ultimate unity ($\bar{\epsilon}\nu$ or $\mu\bar{o}\bar{v}\bar{a}\bar{s}$), prior to the derivative unity which with the Indeterminate Dyad generates

¹ See K. Praechter in *Genethliakon Robert*, pp. 120 sqq.

⁴ *Isag.*, c. 3; cf. c. 6, and *Didascalicus*, c. 4 (p. 155 fin., Hermann).

² See in particular the interesting recent book of M. Jean Wahl, *Étude sur le Parménide*.

⁵ 'On the Interpretation of Plato's Parmenides,' *Mind*, 1896 7, 1903.

³ In *Parm.*, p. 635. Cousin; cf. *Theol. Plat.* I. 8 sqq.

⁶ *Adv. Phys.* II. 281-2.

⁷ *Philos. d. Mittl. Stoa*. 403-39.

plurality. This view is ascribed to 'the Pythagoreans' by Eudorus,¹ a Platonist who is dated about 25 B.C., as well as by Proclus² and others. Syrianus attributes opinions of this sort to Archænetus, Philolaos, and Brotinus.³

This type of monism bears evident marks of Platonic influence. That one of its sources was the sixth book of the *Republic* appears from the statement ascribed by Syrianus to Brotinus, that the supreme principle *νοῦ παντὸς καὶ οὐσίας δυνάμει καὶ πρεσβείᾳ ὑπερέχει*—an obvious echo of Plato's words in *Rep.* 509B. But whence come the two Ones, the transcendent and the derivative? Hardly from primitive Pythagoreanism: for in Aristotle's references to the Pythagoreans there is no trace of any such duplication of the One; and the antithesis of the One and the Indeterminate Dyad is Platonic, not Pythagorean.⁴ The true source is, I think, made apparent by the following passage from Simplicius:

Ταύτην δὲ περὶ τῆς ὑλῆς τὴν ὑπόνοιαν⁵ ἐσίκασιν ἐσχηκέναι πρῶτοι μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι, μετὰ δ' ἐκείνους ὁ Πλάτων, ὡς καὶ Μοδέρατος ἴστορεῖ. οὗτος γὰρ κατὰ τὸν Πυθαγορείοντος τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐν ὑπὲρ τὸ εἶναι καὶ πᾶσαν οὐσίαν ἀποφαίνεται, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ἔν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ δύντας ὅν καὶ νοητόν, τὰ 5. εἶδη φησὶν εἶναι, τὸ δὲ τρίτον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τὸ ψυχικόν, μετέχειν τούτῳ ἐνὸς καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν, τὴν δὲ ἀπὸ τούτου τελευταίαν φύσιν τὴν τῶν αἰσθητῶν οὐσίαν μηδὲ μετέχειν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἔμφασιν ἐκείνων κεκοσμήσθαι, τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς ὑλῆς τούτῳ μὴ δύντος πρώτως ἐν τῷ ποσῷ δύντος οὐσίας σκίασμα καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον ὑποθετηκύιας καὶ ἀπὸ τούτου. καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ὁ Πορφύριος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ Περὶ ὑλῆς τὰ τοῦ 10. Μοδεράτου παρατιθέμενος γέγραφεν διτὶ 'βουληθεὶς ὁ ἐνιαῦτος λόγος, ὡς πού φησιν ὁ Πλάτων, τὴν γένεσιν ἀφ' ἐαυτοῦ τῶν δύντων συστήσασθαι, κατὰ στέρησιν αὐτοῦ ἔχωρησε⁶ τὴν ποσότητα πάντων αὐτὴν στερήσας τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων καὶ εἰδῶν. τοῦτο δὲ ποσότητα. ἐκάλεσεν ἄμορφον καὶ ἀδιάρετον καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον, ἐπιδεχομένην μέντοι μορφὴν σχῆμα διαίρεσιν ποιότητα πᾶν τὸ τοιοῦτον . . .'.⁷

This passage was alleged by Vacherot⁸ as proving that the Neoplatonic trinity and the Neoplatonic doctrine of Matter were anticipated by Moderatus—a Pythagorean who can be dated to the second half of the first century A.D. Zeller⁹ replied that it proved nothing of the kind. He pointed out (rightly)

¹ *Apro Simplic. in Phys.* 181. 10-30, especially 27 sqq.: ὡς μὲν ἀρχὴ τὸ ἔν, ὡς δὲ στοιχεῖα τὸ ἔν καὶ ἡ δόρστος δύνα, ἀρχαὶ ἀμφοὶ ἐν δύνται πάλιν· καὶ δῆλον ὅτι ἀλλο μὲν ἔστιν ἐν ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν πάλιν, ἀλλο δὲ ἐν τῷ τῇ δύνατι δύτικεμένον, δ καὶ μονάδα καλούσιν. The words occur in a verbatim citation from Eudorus.

² *In Tim.* 54D [I. 176. 9 sqq., Diehl]: προηγέται γὰρ τὸ ἐν ἀρτίσης ἐναρτώσεως, ὡς καὶ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι φασιν. ἀλλ' ἔστι καὶ μετὰ τὴν μίαν αἰτίαν ἡ δύνα τῶν ἀρχῶν ἀνεφάνη, καὶ ἐν ταύταις ἡ μονὰς κρίτων τῆς δύνατος. . . . Cf. Theo Smyrn., *Explan. Math.* 19. 12 sqq., Hiller; Damascius, *de principiis* 86, 20 sqq., Ruelle [115, Kopp]; and for what seems to be a different way of putting essentially the same view, Numenius *ap.* Chalcid. *in Tim.*, c. 293, Mullach, and ps.-Alexander *in*

Metaph. 800. 32, Bonitz (quoted below, p. 138).

³ *In Metaph.* 925b 27 sqq.: καὶ έτι πρὸ τῶν δύο ἀρχῶν τὴν ἐνιαῦταν αἰτίαν προέτασσον, ἦν Ἀρχαλεύτος [Ἀρχότας *ci.* Boeckh] μὲν αἰτίαν πρὸ αἰτίας εἰναὶ φησι, Φιλόλαος δὲ τῶν πάλιν ἀρχῶν εἶναι δυσχυρίζεται, Βροτίνος δὲ ὡς νοῦ παντὸς καὶ οὐσίας δυνάμεις καὶ πρεσβεία ὑπερέχει. Cf. 935b 13 sqq.

⁴ Arist. *Metaph.* A 6. 987b 25.

⁵ Sc. διτὶ δεύτερος καὶ δύτικες ἔστιν.

⁶ ἔχωρης Zeller: fort. ἔχορηγης.

⁷ *In Phys.* A 7, 230, 34 sqq., Diels.

⁸ *Hist. de l'École d'Alex.* I. 309.

⁹ III³. 126. 2. In the fourth edition the passage is treated more summarily, and some modifications are introduced (III. ii. 143. 1; cf. 130. 5).

that . . .
of M . . .
and t . . .
κατὰ . . .
gorea . . .
again . . .
only . . .
Mod . . .
Essa . . .
Porp . . .
τὸ ψ . . .
the e . . .
com . . .
l. 9 ;
in gi . . .

in th . . .
lines . . .
to an . . .
third . . .
of th . . .
was c . . .
world . . .
and i . . .
μὴ ὁ . . .
the F . . .
fourt . . .
φησι . . .
the g . . .
the s . . .
prete . . .

Who . . .
if oὐ . . .
we a . . .
plato . . .
But . . .
witho . . .
'Thi . . .
gorea . . .
is to . . .

¹ In
ἐνόλα

Platonist
Syrianus
s.³
That one
testament
avtōs kai
f Plato's
udent and
ristotle's
on of the
Platonic,
following

μὲν τῶν
ἰστορεῖ.
πᾶσαν
ητόν, τὰ
καὶ τῶν
μηδὲ
τοῦ μὴ
ενίας καὶ
τὰ τοῦ
, ὡς πού
αι, κατὰ
ν ἀντοῦ
ετον καὶ
ητα πᾶν

platonic
oderatus
tury A.D.
(rightly)
p. 138).
ο δὲ τῶν δύο
Αρχαλύτερος
άιτια εἶναι
ι διωχθεί-
ας δυνάμει

ition the
and some
143. 1;

that if the words *οὗτος γὰρ*, etc. (l. 3 sqq.), refer simply to the private opinions of Moderatus, they do not show the dependence of Plato on Pythagoreanism, and the *γὰρ* is therefore meaningless. He accordingly supposed that *οὗτος γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγορείους* meant not 'Moderatus in accordance with the Pythagoreans,' but 'Plato according to the Pythagoreans.' He also pointed out—again quite rightly—that Simplicius is not citing Moderatus at first hand, but only (as the beginning of the third sentence shows) Porphyry's report of what Moderatus said: 'And this also Porphyry has written in the second book of his *Essay on Matter*, quoting Moderatus.' He then bracketed as additions by Porphyry (1) the words *ὅπερ ἔστι τὸ ὄντως ὅν καὶ νοητόν* in l. 4, and *ὅπερ ἔστι τὸ ψυχικόν* in the next line; (2) the remark about the two kinds of *μὴ ὅν* at the end of the same sentence, from *τῆς ἐν αὐτοῖς* down to *καὶ ἀπὸ τούτον*. In his earlier editions he also ascribed to Porphyry the whole passage in inverted commas from *βουληθεῖς* onwards, reading the aorist participle *παραθέμενος* in l. 9; but he withdrew this when it was found that the MSS. were unanimous in giving the present, *παρατιθέμενος*.

Now it seems to me that the key to the understanding of this passage lies in the fact, which neither Vacherot nor Zeller recognized, that the first eight lines refer to the interpretation of Plato's *Parmenides*. This should be obvious to anybody who knows his Proclus, or even his Plato. The first, second, and third 'Ones' are the three Ones which are posited in the first three hypotheses of the *Parmenides*, and the interpretation here given to them is the same which was current in the school of Plotinus. In what follows (ll. 6-8) the sensible world is analyzed into two elements, viz. 'reflections' (*ἐμφάσεις*) of the Forms and material *ὕλη*: the latter is absolute *μὴ ὅν*, and is a shadow of the relative *μὴ ὅν* [=Neoplatonic 'intelligible Matter'] which is implied by the plurality of the Forms (*ἐν τῷ ποσῷ ὄντος*). This corresponds to Proclus' explanation of the fourth and fifth hypotheses of the *Parmenides*.¹ Finally, the words *ὡς πού φησιν ὁ Πλάτων* (l. 10) can best be justified if we take them as an allusion to the genesis of plurality from the self-diremption of the *ἐν ὅν* [*ἐνιαῖος λόγος*] in the second hypothesis, in combination with the *ἐκμαγέῖον* of the *Timaeus* interpreted as relative *μὴ ὅν*.

What we have before us, then, is an interpretation of the *Parmenides*. Whose interpretation is it? Not just that of Simplicius or of Porphyry. Even if *οὗτος κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγορείους* means 'Plato according to the Pythagoreans,' we are still dealing with an interpretation not first invented by the Neoplatonists, but taken over by them, at least in part, from an earlier source. But Zeller's objection to referring *οὗτος* to Moderatus, namely that the *γὰρ* is without meaning, has now disappeared. Simplicius' argument may now run: 'This conception of Matter goes back to Plato, and ultimately to the Pythagoreans, as Moderatus relates: for (*γὰρ*) Moderatus shows that the *Parmenides* is to be interpreted on Pythagorean lines (*κατὰ τοὺς Πυθαγορείους*), and that

¹ In *Parm.* 1064: *τὴν δὲ τετάρτην περὶ τῶν* writers had found the same topics in other *ἐνύλων . . . τὴν δὲ πέμπτην περὶ ὕλης*. Earlier hypotheses (*ibid.* 1052-9).

when so interpreted it is found to contain this conception of Matter.' Everything down to *ἀπὸ τούτου* (with the possible exception of the two *ὅπερ* clauses) will in that case be genuine Moderatus. That this is the right way of taking the passage seems to me probable, from the following considerations:

(a) *οὐτός* is most naturally referred to the nearer name, which is Moderatus. (This, of course, is not by itself decisive.)

(b) Zeller's way of taking it makes *Plato* talk about the first, the second, and the third 'One,' and about the identity of the second 'One' with the Ideas: which he does not do in the *Parmenides* or anywhere else. Zeller refers to the passage in the Second Letter¹ about the three grades of reality: but they are not called 'Ones,' and there is no mention of the Ideas. An *interpreter* of the *Parmenides*, on the other hand, could very well find these doctrines implied though not expressed in it.

(c) The use of *τὸ ποσόν* (l. 8) or *ποσότης* (l. 11) as a description of the element of plurality in the intelligible world is genuinely Neopythagorean: e.g. Theon of Smyrna, in a passage which seems to be based upon Moderatus himself, defines number as *τὸ ἐν νοητοῖς ποσόν*.² Hence it is not unreasonable to suppose that the substance of ll. 6-8 and 10-14 goes back to Moderatus.³

(d) Lastly, the impression that the Neoplatonic interpretation of the *Parmenides* is in its basis Neopythagorean is strengthened by a remark of pseudo-Alexander: *Οἱ μέν, ὡσπερ Πλάτων καὶ Βροτίνος ὁ Πυθαγόρειος, φασὶν ὅτι τὸ ἀγαθὸν αὐτὸ τὸ ἐν ἐστὶ καὶ οὐσίωται ἐν τῷ ἐν εἴναι* (in *Metaph.* 800, 32, Bonitz). The subtle doctrine that the super-essential One, *οὐσίωται ἐν τῷ ἐν εἴναι*, 'has become essence in so far as it is One,' can hardly come from any other source than the *Parmenides*,⁴ whence we must suppose it to have passed into the Pythagorean apocrypha. The attribution of such a doctrine to the

¹ 312E.

² *Expos. rev. math.* 19. 15, Hiller. Theon 18. 3-9+19. 8-9, 12-13, reproduces almost word for word a fragment of Moderatus preserved by Stobaeus, *Ed.* I. i. 8 [18H]; while the continuation in Theon 19. 13-20. 11 is an expansion of the next *sententia* in Stobaeus, *Ed.* I. i. 9. This second *sententia* is *ἀδέστοτος* in our MSS. of Stobaeus, but Theon must have found the two juxtaposed; and while he may possibly have come upon them in some doxographical writer afterwards used by Stobaeus, it is simplest to suppose with Wachsmuth that he read both of them in Moderatus—presumably in his work *τερπὶ τῶν ἀριθμῶν* (Porphy. *vit. Pyth.* 48).

³ The continuation of Simplicius' citation from Porphyry runs as follows (231. 12-24): *ἐν τούτης ἔουσε, φησί, τῆς ποσότητος ὁ Πλάτων τὰ πλειόνα ὄντα κατηγορήσας 'πανδεχή' καὶ ἀνέδεον λέγων καὶ 'ἀβρατόν' καὶ 'ἀπορώτατα τοῦ νοητοῦ μετειληφόντα' αὐτήν καὶ 'λογισμῷ νόθῳ μᾶλις ληπτήν' καὶ πᾶν τὸ τούτοις ἐμφερές. αὕτη δὲ η ποσότης, φησί, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ 'εἶδος' τὸ κατὰ στέρησιν*

*τοῦ ἐντατοῦ λόγου νοούμενον τοῦ πάντας τοὺς λόγους τῶν ὄντων ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιεληφότος παραδείγματά ἔστι τῆς τῶν σωμάτων θλης, ἢν καὶ αὐτήν ποσόν καὶ τὸν Πυθαγόρειον καὶ τὸν Πλάτωνα καλεῖν ἔλεγεν, οὐ τὸ ὡς ποσόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ κατὰ στέρησιν κτλ. (The remainder of the quotation describes the nature of θλη on orthodox Neoplatonic lines.) Here the repeated *φησί* seems to mark the introduction of Porphyry's comments on Moderatus' conception of intelligible ποσότης; while θλη takes us back to the statement attributed to Moderatus at the beginning of the passage. The words in inverted commas are from the *Timaeus* (51A, B; 52B).*

⁴ 142B-E: *ἐν εἰ ἔστιν, ἀρα οἶον τε αὐτὸ εἴναι μέν, οὐσίας δὲ μη μετέχειν; . . . τὸ τε γὰρ ἐν τῷ δύναται τοχεῖ καὶ τὸ δύναται εἴναι. οὐτοτε ἀνάγκη δύναται γιγνόμενον μηδέποτε εἴναι.* Cf. Chalcidius in *Tim.*, c. 293, Mullach: '(Numenius ait) nonnullos Pythagoreos . . . putasse dici etiam illam indeterminatam et immensam duitatem ab una singularitate institutam, recedente a natura sua singularitate et in duitatis habitum migrante.'

historical Brotinus, who lived at the end of the sixth or beginning of the fifth century before Christ, is clearly impossible.

That Pythagoreans should thus take their material from Plato, and that their interpretation of it should influence later Platonists, need not surprise us. Under the Early Empire the two schools were closely associated. Both Numenius¹ and the earlier Neopythagorean epitomized by Photius² saw in Plato what Moderatus saw in him—the popularizer of the Pythagorean philosophy. This view of the relation between Plato and the Pythagoreans is already implied in the story—which in its earliest form goes back at least to the third century B.C.—about the *Timaeus* being copied from a Pythagorean book. It was a view agreeable to the Neopythagoreans: and they sought to confirm it in two ways—by emphasizing real or supposed Pythagorean elements in Plato's teaching, and by introducing Platonic elements into their own pseudepigraphic literature. The latter procedure created 'Brotinus' and his kind; the former led them to seek in Plato a cosmogony based on the One and the Indeterminate Dyad (which passed for Pythagorean), and to find it in the *Parmenides*. That their interpretations soon began to influence the revived Platonic school is shown by the fact that Eudorus, one of its earliest known representatives, 'emended' or falsified a passage in Aristotle's *Metaphysics*³ in order to make Aristotle ascribe to Plato the same doctrine which Eudorus found in the Pythagoreanism of his own day. Later, Plutarch shows clearly the influence of Neopythagoreanism; while in the eclectic Platonist Alcinous (or Albinus) the Neopythagorean transcendence theory appears in hopelessly inconsistent combination with the immanence theory (God = *νοῦς* = the sum of the Ideas) which had developed under peripatetic and Stoic influence. In his attempt to connect these divergent views he foreshadows Plotinus: his complete failure to make anything coherent of them is one measure of Plotinus' greatness. In the school of Plotinus himself the works of men like Numenius and his pupil Kronius were studied no less than those of orthodox Platonists.⁴ Longinus, who was in a position to know, regarded Plotinus as the ablest exponent of the Pythagorean and Platonic *ἀρχαί*: these *ἀρχαί*, he tells us, had been expounded earlier by Numenius, Kronius, *Moderatus*, and Thrasyllus.⁵

The resemblances between the theology of Plotinus and those of Philo, of the Hermetists, and of certain Gnostics are most easily explained by the

¹ *Ap.* Chalcid. in *Tim.*, c. 293, Mullach.

² Cod. 249, 438b 17, Bekker.

³ *Metaph.* 988a 10-11 (Aristotle reporting Plato's view): *τὰ γὰρ εἴδη τοῦ τι ἐστιν αἱρεῖται τοῖς δόλοις, τοῖς δὲ εἰδέσσιν τὸ έν.* Alexander (in *Metaph.*, 58, 31-59, 8, Hayduck) tells us, on the authority of Aspasius, that Eudorus and Euarmostus read here *τοῖς δὲ εἴδησι τὸ έν καὶ τὴν ὅλην*: and he had himself found this reading in some copies. The effect of the alteration (which may have been suggested by an accidental dittography of the opening words of the next sentence, *καὶ τοῖς δὲ ὅλην*) was to introduce into Aristotle's account of

Plato's system the Neopythagorean and Neoplatonic monism; cf. Eudorus *apud* Simplicium in *Phys.* 181. 10, quoted above, p. 8, n. 1. Harmonizing appears to have been Eudorus' passion, for his ethic, like that of Antiochus, is a blend of Platonic and Stoic (Zeller III. i⁴. 634).

⁴ *Porph. vit. Plot.* 14.

⁵ *Ibid.* 20. Moderatus figures also in the list of authors studied in the school of Plotinus' great contemporary, Origen the Christian (Porph. *ap.* Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* VI. 19. 8. Evidently his was still a name of some significance even in the third century.

assumption of a common source or sources.¹ We have seen that one source of the kind required existed in Neopythagoreanism; and that this Neopythagorean theology was, in part, at any rate, shaped by the *Parmenides*. Who its original creators were, remains uncertain. That Moderatus was not its first sponsor is shown by the testimony of Eudorus, which is something like a century earlier (as to pseudo-Brotinus, I know no means of dating him). Schmekel supposes that this wing of the Neopythagorean school was influenced by Antiochus of Ascalon; but his evidence is meagre, and in view of the well-known Stoicizing tendency of Antiochus it seems most unlikely that he is the source of a transcendent theology. It is more natural to think of the Old Academy, and especially of Speusippus. I could not here attempt a reconstruction of Speusippus' metaphysic, even were the task less desperate than it is. But it is surely significant that his first principle was the One, which according to Aëtius² he distinguished from *νοῦς*; that Aristotle³ appears to credit him with the view that the One was *ὑπερούσιον*, or at any rate *ἀνούσιον*, as well as with the comparison (so often used by Plotinus) of the One to a seed; and that this One was the first of a series of *ἀρχαί*, *ἄλλην μὲν ἀριθμῶν*, *ἄλλην δὲ μεγεθῶν*, *ἐπειτα ψυχῆς*.⁴ It seems to me that with Speusippus we are already well started on the road to Neoplatonism,⁵ and nobody has yet alleged that Plato's nephew was anything but a 'true Greek.'

To say that the *Enneads* were not the starting-point of Neoplatonism but its intellectual culmination⁶ is no disparagement of Plotinus' originality. The philosophical thinking of the first two centuries after Christ was vague, confused and incompetent, as transitional thought is wont to be. Without this thinking the *Enneads* could not have been written. But Plotinus, after the manner of men of genius, fashioned from this unpromising material an edifice which a few of his predecessors may have seen in their dreams but whose construction had remained altogether beyond their powers. Nowhere is the individuality of his genius more manifest than in the doctrine of ecstasy, which for him is the psychological correlate of the doctrine of the One. A recent German writer⁷ has even suggested that Plotinus' personal experience of the *unio mystica* determined his conception of the One. But we have seen that this conception is in substance far older than Plotinus. It is perhaps truer to

¹ Since we know that Plotinus had read Numenius, and there is some reason to think that Numenius had read Philo and Valentinus (Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, p. 109), the possibility that one or both of the last-named writers exercised some *indirect* influence on Plotinus ought not to be ignored; but it will not account for all the facts without a great deal of forcing. That Plotinus himself could take either Philo or Valentinus seriously as an authority I find it hard to believe in the light of such passages as *Ennead* II. ix. 6.

² *Ap. Stob. Ecl. I. i. 29* [58H].

³ *Metaph. N 5*, 1092a. 11-15.

⁴ *Ibid. Z 2*. 1028b 21. The mention of *ψυχῆς*

shows that the doctrine has a general cosmological application, and does not aim merely at distinguishing arithmetic from geometry. The *ἀριθμοί* are for Speusippus what the Forms are for Plotinus.

⁵ I find that the same view is suggested by O. Immisch, *Agatharchidea* (Sitzungsberichte Heidelberger Akad. der Wiss., Philos.-Hist. Klasse, 1919. Abh. 7), p. 37.

⁶ The common view, that they were both, appears to be self-refuting; at any rate, it flies in the face of all historical analogy.

⁷ J. Geffcken, *Der Ausgang des Griechisch-Römischen Heidentums*, p. 47.

say
exp
exp
exp
nize
is ab
we
in th
lati
wher
phil
acce
Emp
unity
unity
unity
incar
cogn
iden

who
myst
the
theo
princ
κατά^τ
όμοι
lang
His
'ori
Juda
the
show
Rep.
mom
also
has
state
visio
a co
pole

¹ T
thoug
doctr
stuff
Iambi

say that his conception of the One determined, not indeed the personal experience itself, but the interpretation which Plotinus attached to that experience. The concept of the One *can* be reached, as Plotinus fully recognizes, by a purely dialectical regress; and the element of personal mysticism is absent, so far as I know, from the fragments of the Neopythagoreans (until we reach Numenius) and of the old Academy. Dialectic, however, as we see in the *Parmenides*, can only tell us what the One is not. This tedious accumulation of negatives may content the metaphysician; but, as Inge says somewhere, one cannot worship the alpha privative. Before the Absolute of the philosopher can become the God of the worshipper, it must somehow be made accessible to human consciousness. But it was an accepted doctrine since Empedocles that like is known only by like. Hence the ultimate principle of unity in the universe is accessible, if at all, only to some ultimate principle of unity in man. Hence, also, such access must be supra-rational: as the cosmic unity transcends the cosmic mind, so must the incarnate unity transcend the incarnate mind. The supreme act of cognition will thus not be strictly cognitive at all, but will consist in the momentary actualization of a potential identity between the Absolute in man and the Absolute outside man.

Such, I take it, is the logical basis of Plotinus' mysticism—the hypothesis whose verification he believed he found in his own inner experience, as other mystics in the like experience have found verification for other hypotheses. In the hypothesis itself I see nothing un-Greek. Starting from the transcendent theology of the *Parmenides* and the *Republic*, it proceeds upon the Platonic principles that like is known by like and that the goal of man is *όμοίωσις θεῷ κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν*.¹ Plato himself had in the *Symposium* traced the stages of that *όμοίωσις*. Platonic too, though bearing the imprint of his own genius, is the language in which Plotinus essays to express his inexpressible experience. His favourite metaphor of illumination has often been alleged as evidence of 'oriental influence.' Light is a natural symbol of deity, and occurs as such in Judaism and Manichaeanism, as well as in nearly all the religious writers of the Hellenistic period.² But an examination of the passages in Plotinus will show that his use of the metaphor rests partly on the comparison of the sun in *Rep.* VI., partly on that passage in the *Seventh Letter* (341C), where the sudden moment of insight is compared to 'a light kindled from a leaping fire'; it was also doubtless in part suggested by his own experience, since the like language has been used by mystics of all countries and ages to describe the onset of the state of rapt. The notion that such expressions in Plotinus must allude to the vision of luminous shapes offered to the initiate in the Isiac mysteries involves a confusion between two forms of religious experience which are spiritually poles apart. For Plotinus the only 'mystery' was the Platonic philosophy.

¹ *Theaet.* 176B. The development of the thought was doubtless influenced by the Stoic doctrine that the *ηγεμονικόν* in man is of one stuff with the *ηγεμονικόν* in the universe; cf. Iamblichus *ap.* Stob. *Ecl.* I. xlii. 37 [886H], where

the similarity between the Plotinian and the Stoic view is pointed out.

² References in J. Kroll, *Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos*, pp. 22 sq., and Nock, *Sallustius*, p. xcix, n. 10.

His attitude towards ritual is showed in his reply to the churchgoer Amelius, ἐκείνους δεῖ πρὸς ἐμὲ ἔργονθαι, οὐκ ἐμὲ πρὸς ἐκείνους.¹

Others have regarded the Plotinian doctrine of ecstasy as oriental on the ground of his supposed dependence on Philo. But Philo, according to the latest *Quellenforschung*, derives what he has in common here with Plotinus mainly from the *Phaedrus* of Plato and from Poseidonius.² And the Plotinian ecstasy is in fact profoundly different from the Philonic. Its distinguishing features are: First, that it comes only as the rare crown of a long intellectual discipline—a discipline which in the supreme moment is transcended but not denied; secondly, that it is clearly distinguished from that condition which Plato called ἐνθουσιασμός or κατοκωχή and which we call the mediumistic trance.³ The Plotinian ecstasy, unlike the Philonic, is achieved by a sustained intellectual effort from within and not by a denial of the reason or by a magical intervention from without; it is presented less as the abnegation of self-hood than as the supreme self-realization.⁴ Here as elsewhere, Plotinus appears not as the subverter of the great tradition of Greek rationalism, but as its last constructive exponent in an anti-rational age. It is true that after Aristotle nearly all the Greek thinkers who counted for anything were in their several ways tainted (or touched to life) by quietism and 'other-worldliness.' Plotinus is no exception to that rule. What makes him exceptional in the third century is his resolute rejection of every short cut to wisdom proffered by Gnostic or theurgist, Mithraist or Christian—his resolute championship of reason as the instrument of philosophy and the key to the structure of the real. To assume his dependence on Philo because both writers talk about ecstasy is like setting out to derive the 'mysticism' of a Bradley from the 'mysticism' of a Madame Blavatsky. If anyone doubts that Plotinus was a man of genius, let him study the efforts of Plotinus' nearest predecessors and followers. Let him soak for a while in the theosophical maunderings of Philo and the Hermetists, in the venomous fanaticism of Tertullian, in the tea-table transcendentalism of Plutarch, in the cultured commonplaces of Maximus, in the amiable pieties of Porphyry, in the really unspeakable spiritualistic drivellings of the *de Mysteriis*—let him do that, and if ever he gets his head above water again, he will see Plotinus in his true historical perspective as the one man who still knew how to think clearly in an age which was beginning to forget what thinking meant.

E. R. DODDS.

¹ Porph. *vit. Plot.* 10 *fin.*

² H. Leisegang, *Der Heilige Geist*, I. i. 163 sqq.

³ The very fact that Plotinus compares his ecstasy with the state of *οἱ ἐνδυνάμωτες καὶ κάτοχοι γενύμενοι* (V. iii. 14) should make it evident that the two conditions are distinct. To Philo, on the other hand, ecstasy means *ἡ ἐνέστος κατοκυνή τε καὶ παντα (quis rer. div. heres 53, 264)*.

* E.g. *Enn.* VI. ix. 22: ἥξει (ἢ ψυχῆ) οὐκ εἰς ἄλλο, ἄλλ' εἰς ἑαυτήν, καὶ οὕτως οὐκ ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἔστιν, ἄλλ' ἐν αὐτῇ· τὸ δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ μόνη καὶ

οὐκέτι ἐν τῷ δυντὶ ἐκείνῳ. Wholly different in spirit is Philo's teaching, with its insistence on τὴν ἐν πάσῃ τοῦ γενητοῦ οὐδένειαν (*de somn. I. 60*). For Philo human and divine nature are mutually exclusive: δταν μὲν γὰρ φῶς τὸ θεῖον ἐπιλάμψῃ, δύεται τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, δταν δὲ ἐκείνῳ δύνται, τοῦτον ἀνίσχει καὶ ἀνατέλλει . . . ἐξουκίσται μὲν γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν ὁ νοῦς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος ἀφίξιν, κατὰ δὲ τὴν μετανάστην αὐτοῦ πάλιν εἰσοκίσται (*quis rer. div. heres* 53, 264-5).

genuine
sophistry
to have
remained
forward
a short
its usual
of the
cause.

The
address
long and
for him
into court
of Athens
the Year
in politics
and History
Dionysius
Certain
his friends
The
Stephanus
section
(a) writer
and of
(b) writer
consists
of the
the wide
pages
(c)

melius,

on the
to the
lotinus
otinian
uishing
lectual
but not
which
umistic
stained
magical
lf-hood
ars not
its last
ristotle
several
lotinus
e third
red by
ship of
ne real.
stasty is
'ism' of
genius,
s. Let
nd the
e tran-
in the
ellings
e water
ne man
o forget
ODDS.

in spirit
on *τὴν ἐν*
60). For
mutually
πιλάμψη,
ταῦ, *τοῦτο*,
ν γὰρ ἐν
τοῖς, *κατὰ*
τοι (*quis*

THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH PLATONIC EPISTLES.

IT is now generally agreed that the 7th and 8th Platonic Epistles are genuine. There may still be a lingering doubt, here or there, about the philosophical digression in the 7th; but with this exception both letters may be said to have established their claim to be regarded as the work of Plato.

Two of the grounds, however, on which they were formerly attacked, still remain as difficulties, for which no solution, quite satisfactory, has been put forward. Another attempt to get rid of these may be worth consideration, and a short review of some of the more recent attempts to remove them may have its uses and warnings. The difficulties are (1) the extraordinary arrangement of the subject matter of the 7th Epistle, and (2) the historical puzzle in the 8th, caused by the death of Dion's son.

I.

The 7th Epistle professes to be a reply to a request for help and counsel addressed to Plato by the friends and connexions of Dion at some time not long after his murder. By far the greater part of it is actually Plato's 'Apologia' for himself. He describes and justifies his own career, so far as it brought him into contact with the political affairs of his day, his detachment from the politics of Athens and his intervention in those of Syracuse, his relations with Dionysios the Younger, and the failure of his attempts to influence that monarch for good in politics and philosophy. The justification of Dion is combined with his own; and Howald's statement (*Die Briefe Platons*, Zürich, 1923), that Plato's grief for Dion is throbbing in every line of the letter, is scarcely an exaggeration. Certainly one of Plato's objects in writing it was to raise a worthy memorial to his friend.

The letter, which contains a little over twenty-eight pages of the edition of Stephanus, may, for the purpose of this paper, be divided roughly into three sections:

(a) A section of between six and seven pages giving an account of the writer's early life, of his visit to Syracuse during the time of Dionysios the Elder, and of the first of his two visits to Dionysios the Younger.

(b) A section of about seven pages, which opens with a statement that the writer is now going to give his advice, but of which by far the greater part consists of a complicated series of digressions, devoted in part to a justification of the conduct and policy of himself and Dion, in part to a condemnation of the wickedness of Dion's murderers. The actual advice occupies less than two pages at the end of this section.

(c) A section of fourteen pages, of which twelve are occupied with Plato's

second visit to the younger Dionysios and the events which immediately preceded and followed it, no less than five pages being devoted to their relations as teacher and pupil. Towards the close there is a striking peroration, in which the writer returns to Dion's murder and defends in impassioned terms his friend's character and aims. Two or three formal sentences bring the letter to an end.

This general plan was not incongruous, so long as the letter was supposed to be merely a 'defence of the Master,' written after his death by one of his disciples, to meet the posthumous attacks directed against his intervention in Sicilian affairs. But if we accept it as the work of Plato himself, and believe that it was actually sent to Syracuse in reply to an appeal for help and advice from the Dionean party—men with whom Plato had been in intimate relations during his second and third visits to Sicily, and who were well aware of the whole story of those visits—the difficulties become overwhelming. Nor are they removed by supposing that the document was an open letter sent to Sicily for general circulation. The 8th Epistle starts with a statement in plain terms that it is a document of this sort, and it fulfils its purpose. It is free from the cumbersome digressions of the 7th and from lengthy personal narratives of the past; it is straightforward and lucid in its language, and deals with the urgent problems of the present. But it requires great powers of faith to believe that the 7th Epistle was either sent to Syracuse in response to a request from the Dionean party, or written for such a purpose. Plato did not entirely lose his sense of humour in his old age; and, apart from difficulties of construction, it is most unlikely that the forcible and often quoted description of the luxury and debauchery of the Sicilian and Italian Greeks (326 *b, c, d*) would have been included in a letter intended for circulation in that region.

More than one theory has been put forward to meet this difficulty. M. Odau in his Dissertation (Königsberg, 1906) suggests that the letter actually sent to Syracuse consisted of an introductory portion comprising the first and third of the sections mentioned above, and of a concluding portion which was what we have now as the 8th Epistle. A document thus constituted would give, in a consecutive form, both a personal defence of Plato and full and intelligible counsel to his friends.

Odau supposes that the 7th and 8th Epistles, as we now have them, are the result of a re-editing which this document received not long after Plato's death, from one of his disciples who had access to his papers. Among these the conjectural editor found a rough copy of a letter, which was Plato's first draft of a reply to the request of Dion's friends for advice, but which had been rejected by him in favour of the fuller document described above. The editor, he supposes, after certain necessary alterations in this draft, interpolated it, with a few introductory sentences by himself, after the words *ο δέ ἐνίκησεν ἀντιτείνων* in Ep. VII. 330*b*. This rendered it necessary to detach from the document its concluding portion, 352*b* to 357*d*. A formula of greeting was, therefore, inserted, and this portion was transformed into a separate letter. Confirmation for the

supposed detachment of this portion was found in the fact that the formula of greeting for the 8th Epistle is actually missing in the Paris MS. A.

As no one now is likely seriously to support this theory, it need not be discussed in detail. Its author has probably long ago abandoned it. It has the merit, however, of recognizing that the letter, in its present form, is an impossible document, if its setting is accepted as historical fact.

Odau's theory is criticized by Hackforth (*The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles*, Manchester, 1913, pp. 95 sqq.), who defends the letter as it stands, justifying its digressions and arrangement. His defence shows adequately that the letter, regarded as a piece of literature, is a work which has, both in structure and style, the characteristics of Plato's latest manner, and that it is not unworthy of a place by the side of his *Laws*. But it does not remove the difficulty of believing that it was actually sent to Sicily in answer to an appeal from the Dionean party.

O. Apelt also (*Platons Briefe*, Leipzig, 1918, pp. 125-7) is satisfied with the letter as it stands. He feels strongly that, though addressed to the friends of Dion, it was an open letter, intended for general circulation—for Athens, perhaps, more than for Sicily—that its superscription was a sort of 'Deck-adresse,' behind which stood the general public. But he expresses no doubt as to the reality of the historical setting, which the letter presupposes. W. Andreae's edition of the Letters (Jena, 1923) contains an excellent account of the 7th, but with regard to the historical setting his attitude is the same as that of Apelt. C. Ritter (*Plato's Gesetze*, Komm. p. 376) and U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (*Platon I*. 647), both accept the request for counsel from the Dionean party as matter of fact; the latter considers that only the 8th Epistle was sent to Sicily in response to it, the 7th being intended for general circulation only, and this is the view which comes nearest to removing the difficulty; but it does not go far enough.

Two of the later editors, E. Howald (*loc. cit.* pp. 20 sqq.) and L. A. Post (*Thirteen Epistles of Plato*, Oxford, 1925) feel that the structure of the 7th Epistle requires more explanation. Howald supplies this by a theory which is as conjectural as that of Odau. According to him the original nucleus of the letter was a speech composed by Plato in defence of the Sicilian episode of his life and of his deeper philosophical teaching. When this was finished, but not yet published, he received the request for help and advice from the friends of Dion, and formed the 'unfortunate idea' of serving up his speech as part of his reply to his correspondents, combining with it a section containing his advice. But before the document in this new form was finished, Howald supposes that another letter arrived from Sicily, informing Plato of the fall of Kallippos and the seizure of Syracuse by Dion's nephew, Hipparinos. He then decided to leave unfinished this composite document, and, in place of it, wrote and despatched the 8th Epistle. Our 7th Letter thus remained on his hands as an unfinished draft—a supposition which accounts for the numerous difficulties which its language presents.

Post's theory has a good deal in common with that of Howald. He thinks that the part of the letter which forms Plato's *Apologia pro Vita Sua* was composed first before the murder of Dion, that it came into circulation, and suggested to Isokrates his *Apologia* in the Speech on the Antidosis—that later it was fitted into the framework in which we have it, the framework being a letter of advice to the friends of Dion, who wrote to Plato after they had fled from Syracuse to Leontini. He does not share Howald's view that the letter was never sent, but he considers that 'the joints between Plato's defence and his letter of advice are so rudely constructed that the artifice is transparent.' He suggests that the Speech of Isokrates appeared while Plato was still writing, and that the defence of Dion was introduced to meet covert attacks on him contained in the orator's praises of Timotheos. The relation between the 7th Epistle and the Speech on the Antidosis is considered in a Note at the end of this paper.

Structural theories of this kind, when there is no positive evidence of matter or style to prove difference of authorship or of date for the divisions proposed, must rest for the most part upon imagination. The 7th Epistle calls for different treatment. The first step is to recognize, with U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, that the letter was not sent to Sicily, nor written for that purpose. I need not repeat the proofs of this. But we must go further than this, and put the question: Is it necessary to treat the letter from the friends of Dion as actual fact? If the 7th Epistle was neither sent to them nor written for them, is it not as plain as daylight that their appeal is merely a literary fiction, introduced as a picturesque setting for Plato's letter? Plato had a gift for imaginative fiction. No one thinks of taking as actual fact the whole setting of the *Republic* or the *Symposium*. It is obvious that in these cases we have the same skilful combination of fact with fiction which we expect in a historical novel. Surely we may credit Plato with the power of providing as good a setting for a letter. He not only had it, but has used it so successfully, that his modern readers follow one another in accepting his little fiction as sober fact.

Let us try to put ourselves into the position of Plato at Athens, when the news of Dion's murder reached him. It was conveyed by a letter from Kallippos to the Government of Athens, describing himself as a tyrannicide¹ (Plut. *Dion* 58). Kallippos had, in fact, done what everyone suspected Dion of intending to do: he had seized the coveted position of tyrant. He was master of the impregnable citadel, and maintained his power by the aid of the mercenaries, with whom he had ingratiated himself by bribery before the murder. The entry to the harbour was commanded by the citadel, and was so narrow that only one ship could leave it at a time; under the tyranny none left it without careful scrutiny (Plat. Ep. VII., 329 e). It is most unlikely that any letter from the friends of Dion was conveyed by the ship that carried the

¹ It is worth noting that Aristotle in his passing reference to the murder (*Rhet.* I. 12, 1373a'19) treats it as justifiable, on the ground that Dion was actually a tyrant.

despa
mont
very
party
muni
it like
had
succe
Plato

the s
time,
playe
be m
comp
enthu
gossip
negle
7th E
been
aloof
But t
he sp
young
Syrac

T
vention
his fri
was n
a spee
made
the p
written
with l
to the
pamp
which
piece
pages
it a te
The e

¹ Plat
him by
of the E

despatch of Kallippos, or by any other that left Syracuse during the ensuing months. Of actual occurrences during the thirteen months' rule of Kallippos very little is known. In the course of it (we are not told when) the Dionean party were obliged to fly from Syracuse to Leontini. But from there communications with Athens must have been a matter of some difficulty. Nor is it likely that the party thought of appealing to Plato for help or advice. They had their own plans for the removal of Kallippos, which were ultimately successful, and to which I shall return later; but they were not plans which Plato was likely to be able to assist in any way.

The letter of Kallippos to the Athenians gave, no doubt, the version of the story which best suited his own purposes; but it would, in the course of time, be supplemented by news from other sources as to the part which he had played in Dion's downfall and the nature of his subsequent rule. There would be much uncertainty about details, but no doubt about the central fact—the complete failure of Dion's schemes, and the final shipwreck of the hopes which enthusiasts had associated with Plato's visits to Sicily. The scraps of literary gossip which have survived are sufficient evidence that adverse critics did not neglect their opportunity; and to anyone reading between the lines of the 7th Epistle it is plain enough that we have in it the defence of a man who had been the object of unkind attacks. Plato maintains an attitude of dignified aloofness, and does not descend to personal controversy with antagonists. But the concluding sentences evidently refer to such attacks, and when in 330^c he speaks of those who put the question why he made a second visit to the younger Dionysios, the people whom he means must be at Athens and not at Syracuse.

The position at Athens called for an immediate defence of Plato's interventions in practical politics, of his attitude as a teacher of philosophy, and of his friend Dion. The defence had to be in some literary form. The dialogue was not suited to such a purpose. Howald suggests that Plato actually wrote a speech. In the middle of the fourth century the writings of Isokrates had made the fictitious speech, published but never delivered, a familiar form for the political pamphlet. But Plato had never been a professional speech-writer, and it is most unlikely that he would have entered into competition with Isokrates by adopting this form for his defence. The letter was not open to the same objection. Isokrates had, it is true, thrown three of his public pamphlets into this form; but Plato himself had used it in his 3rd Epistle, which had been sent to Sicily two or three years before, for circulation as a piece of political propaganda. It is rather short for the purpose—four or five pages of Stephanus—but it contains dramatic touches which must have made it a telling document at the moment. Its setting has all the marks of fiction. The envoys,¹ whose reports of the conversations of Dionysios are said to be

¹ Plato's envoys may have been suggested to him by the fictitious envoy in the first sentence of the Epistle of Isokrates to the children of Jason of Pherae, which was published about three years before the 3rd Platonic Epistle.

the occasion of the 3rd Letter, may be assumed to be as imaginary as the letter from the friends of Dion which is the professed occasion of the 7th. It was natural that Plato should adopt for his defence the form of a similar but more extensive letter, enlivened in the same way with dramatic scenes and scraps of dialogue, and provided with a suitable, but purely fictitious, setting; and it was surely a happy thought to make this letter a reply to an appeal from the Dionean party; for it gave him a reason for combining with his own justification that of his friend.

If the 7th Epistle is regarded in this light, as a purely literary document, intended for readers at Athens and in the Greek world generally, its eccentricities of arrangement call for no defence from those who are familiar with the *Laws*, on which Plato must have been working at the same time. Its digressions, and the liberties which the writer allows himself, are not a whit more startling than those of the *Laws*; and it will always be found that, puzzling as the procedure sometimes is, there is some method behind it. The writer may here or there have inserted old material, which he had already on his hands (as, e.g., at 330c 9, $\tauὸν συμβούλευοντα κ.τ.λ.$). Such insertions are often traceable in the work of old men. There is no need for any theory of editing or of reconstruction, except for those who believe in the reality of the letter from the friends of Dion. Let this be transferred once for all to the region of fiction to which it belongs, and all serious difficulties with regard to structure are removed.

Before leaving the 7th Epistle something must be said about the date of its publication. Here again we have to depend on conjecture; but two things stand out clearly:

(1) The letter was finished before the end of the rule of Kallippos. Plato regarded Kallippos as a fiend incarnate, and some allusion to his downfall would have been inevitable, if it had occurred.

(2) It bears in many places the marks of hurried writing. The writer's mind is too full of intense feeling for adherence to conventions of literary prose. Instances of this will be found in 325c 5 to 326b 4, 332c 6 to 333a 5, 335a 2 to c 1, 335e 3 to 336b 8; and most of the narrative parts of the letter give the impression of having been rapidly dictated. The whole can hardly have taken more than two or three months to write.

Now as to the date of Dion's murder there is reasonable certainty. Diodorus (XVI. 31) places it in Ol. 106, 3, and in the archonship of Diotimos; both these years began at the summer solstice of 354 B.C. Plutarch (*Dion*, 58) says that the murder took place on the day of the festival of the Koreia: this was a harvest festival (Diod. V. 4): his authority at this point of his Life of Dion is most probably Timaios,¹ who must have talked with those who were contemporaries of the murder, and may be accepted as a credible witness for

¹ See W. Biedenweg, *Plutarchs Quellen in den Lebensbeschreibungen des Dion und Timoleon*. Leipzig, 1884. There is much that is still valuable in this monograph, but for the Life of Dion the

writer was much hampered by adopting the views current at the moment about the Platonic Epistles, and this part of the work ought to be done again.

the date. We may date the murder, therefore, about midsummer, 354 B.C.¹ Kallippos must have written to Athens soon after he had secured his position, and his letter was probably received before the end of August. The 7th Epistle may well have been finished and in circulation before the end of the year 354 B.C.²

II.

Some apology is needed for bringing up again the historical difficulty in the 8th Epistle caused by the death of Dion's son. For it has recently been dealt with at some length in L. A. Post's paper, 'A supposed Discrepancy,' etc. (*Amer. Journ. Phil.*, Vol. XLV., p. 371). But the data of the problem are altered, if the view is accepted that the 7th Epistle was not preceded by any communication from the friends of Dion. They are still further altered by a point which I shall now try to establish with regard to the 8th Epistle. Before doing so, I must call attention to two features in that letter. (1) It stands by itself, and is quite independent of the 7th Epistle. The supposed references to the earlier letter have been misinterpreted. Howald (*l.c.*, p. 19) establishes this clearly, and his arguments need not be repeated here. (2) It does not profess to be a reply to any letter from the Dionean Party.

The letter announces itself as an open letter, and is well suited to this purpose. When was it written? Those who accept it as genuine have usually assumed that it belongs to the time *after* the expulsion of Kallippos. Why? There is not a word in the letter itself to justify such a view, and a great deal against it. What we learn from the letter is that the Dionean party have joined forces with Hipparinos, Dion's nephew and the half-brother of Dionysios the Younger—that they have received help from him, that he has shown a pious temperament (*ὅσιος τρόπος*), and that, though the son of a tyrant, he is of his own free will setting the city free (356a; the present *ἐλευθεροῖ* implies attempted action). There is not a word to suggest that Kallippos has already been ousted from the citadel. Surely if Plato had heard that this had happened, he would have dwelt upon it with some emphasis. On the contrary, the letter implies that Kallippos is still a person to be reckoned with. Plato says that he wishes to bring about a coalition of all parties, including Dionysios, but excepting the one *ἀνοσιούργος*, i.e. Kallippos (353c 3). The position is clear enough, if we suppose Kallippos to be in possession of the citadel.

Our information from other sources about the events of these months is meagre. They belong to the interval between Plutarch's lives of Dion and

¹ Holm (*Gesch. Sic.* II. 463) gives the date as August 354 B.C. on the grounds stated above. August is too late for the Sicilian harvest, which would take place in June. Bury (*Gk. Hist.* 672, Ed. 1902) and Freeman (*Sicily*, Vol. IV. 285) give June 354 B.C. as the date of the murder. If we are to bring it into Ol. 106, 3 and the archon-

ship of Diotimos, it must have been towards the close of the month, after the summer solstice.

² For the bearing of this date on the relations between the 7th Epistle and the Speech of Isocrates on the Antidosis see note at the end of this paper.

Timoleon, and the only facts which we learn from him are—that the first act of Kallippos was to put the family of Dion in prison, where they remained till released after his expulsion; that during this captivity a posthumous child was born to Dion; and that Kallippos lost Syracuse while engaged in an expedition against Katane (Plut. *Dion*, 57, 58).

I have referred above to Diodorus XVI. 31, where he dates the murder in Ol. 106, 3: the only further detail added there is that Kallippos reigned for thirteen months. In XVI. 36 under Ol. 106, 4 and the archonship of Eudemos (353 B.C.) he continues the story as follows: 'In Syracuse civil strife occurred between the friends of Dion and Kallippos. The friends of Dion were worsted and fled to Leontini. After some time Hipparinos, the son of Dionysios (i.e. Dionysios I.) sailed to Syracuse with a force, and Kallippos was defeated and driven out of the city. Hipparinos, after recovering his father's tyranny, reigned for two years.'

A passage in Polyaeus (*Strateg.* V. 4: see Hackforth *l.c.*, p. 85) gives the story rather differently. He says: 'Hipparinos, being at Leontini, and perceiving that the city of the Syracusans was undefended, because the citizens had marched to a certain place, marched from Leontini and seized the city of the Syracusans.' One more gleam of light comes from the fact that Eudemos, the friend of Aristotle, one of the associates of Plato in the Academy who accompanied Dion in his Sicilian expedition, lost his life in one of the attacks on Kallippos which the party of Dion made from their refuge at Leontini. From the story told by Cicero (*De Div.* I. 25) it seems clear that the death of Eudemos took place in 353 B.C.

The most probable view of the facts is that there were two sets of operations—attacks by land from Leontini, and a final assault with ships which led to the capture of the citadel. The ships must have come from Dionysios, who was probably behind the operations all the while, all parties having united for the moment to get rid of the alien, Kallippos.

If we now put the question, at what moment was the 8th Epistle written, there ought to be little doubt that it was after the news of the earlier attacks from Leontini had arrived at Athens and before the final blow which gave Hipparinos the citadel. Obvious as this view is, no one seems to have put it forward. I can see no possible objection to it, and shall adopt it for the purpose of this paper, in addition to the point previously established, that the letter from the friends of Dion, mentioned in the 7th Epistle, is a literary fiction. On these suppositions I will turn to the historical difficulty of the 8th Epistle.

In the latter part of that letter Dion is introduced giving his advice in the form of an address to the Syracusans. He recommends the establishment of an oligarchical constitution to be designed by commissioners, and at the head of it three kings, in a position resembling that of the kings of Sparta or the English monarchy. The three persons whom Dion suggests for this position are (1) his own son, whose name is not mentioned; (2) Hipparinos, the son of

first act of
nained till
child was
expedition

murder in
eigned for
Eudemos
occurred
re worsted
Dionysios
s defeated
s tyranny,

gives the
ntini, and
e citizens
e city of
Eudemos,
emy who
e attacks
Leontini.
death of

of opera-
which led
sios, who
nited for

written,
r attacks
ich gave
ave put it
for the
that the
literary
ty of the

ce in the
hment of
the head
a or the
position
e son of

Dionysios the Elder, and (3) Dionysios the Younger ; and the difficulty is that three other authorities, Plutarch, Nepos, and Aelian, state that Dion's son had met his end, either by accident or by suicide, before his father's murder.

The words in which Dion is made to put forward the recommendation of his son are these (355e) : 'And besides all this do you, with all sincerity and soundness of purpose and with the gods helping you, set up as king—in the first place, my own son, as a reward for two services, that rendered by me and that rendered by my father, for he at that time freed the city from barbarians, and I have now twice freed it from tyrants, as you yourselves have witnessed.' Again at the close of his speech, when justifying his proposals, Dion adds : 'These are not impossibilities. For when a policy has already been adopted by two minds, and presents itself as obviously the best course for reasoning men to adopt, surely the man who pronounces it an impossibility is ill-advised. The two minds that I mean are those of Hipparinos, the son of Dionysios, and of my own son. For if these two agree together, I think that all the rest of the Syracusans who care for their country must adopt the same view.'

It is usually said that there are three conceivable ways of meeting this difficulty: We may say either (a) that the other authorities are wrong, and that Dion's son was not dead ; or (b) that the news of his death had not reached reached Plato ; or (c) that Plato is referring to Dion's posthumous son, who was born while his mother was shut up in the prison of Kallippos.

The third of these views is put forward strongly by Post in the paper referred to above (*Am. Journ. Phil.* Vol. XLV.), who tries hard to show that in the passage quoted above Plato uses language suited to an infant in arms. If we have decided that the 8th Epistle was written while Dion's widow was in prison, we need no longer consider this view as a possibility. For during the mother's imprisonment no tidings of the birth of the posthumous son could have reached Plato at Athens. The posthumous child cannot possibly be the person alluded to.

We have, therefore, only to consider the first two views. As the historical problem is a nice one, it is worth while to give a fuller account of the data. Plutarch, the most important authority, who here again is probably drawing his information from Timaios, tells us (*Dion*, 55) that, when the conspiracy of Kallippos was being formed, Dion was sitting one evening in the portico of his house. He heard a sound at the other end of the portico, and, looking up, saw a woman of lofty stature, who resembled in dress and features the Furies of tragedy, and was sweeping the house with a broom. Startled and alarmed, he sent for his friends, told them the vision, and begged them to stay with him for the night, in case it should re-appear. It was not seen again ; but a few days later, his son, who was just growing out of boyhood (*σχεδὸν ἀντίταυς ὥν*), in consequence of some vexation and anger arising from a trifling and childish cause, threw himself from the roof and was killed.

Plutarch adds that Kallippos thereupon spread a rumour that Dion, having lost his own son, was going to adopt Apollokrates, the son of Dionysios, as his

successor in the tyranny, and that this helped him to bring his conspiracy to a head.

Nepos probably had some other authority before him. He mentions the suicide parenthetically (*Dion*, 4) and without any precise indication of time, while relating an earlier part of Dion's life. He says that, while Dion was in the Peloponnese getting together forces for his expedition, Dionysios, having Dion's family in his power, encouraged the boy in vicious habits, so that his character became completely depraved. After the return of Dion, when he was trying to reform his son's character, and had placed him under strict guardians, the boy could not endure this new kind of life, and committed suicide by throwing himself down from the roof of the house.

Aelian is certainly following a different authority. He tells the story (*V. H. III. 4*) as a short anecdote with no details of time, grouping it with other instances of the fortitude of parents on the occasion of the death of their children. He says: 'Dion, the son of Hipparinos and the associate of Plato, happened to be engaged in public and national affairs, when his son lost his life by falling from the roof into the court of the house. Dion did not allow himself to be affected by this incident, but went on doing that on which he was engaged before.'

These stories do not agree together, and it is easy to criticize each of them individually as suspicious. But they do show that the writers had before them more than one independent authority for the fact of the death of Dion's son. That fact is supported by another important piece of testimony, which some of the critics have ignored. Dion's son quite certainly disappears from the scene after his father's murder. He was not one of those imprisoned by Kallippos and released at the end of his rule; nor was he with those poor unfortunates when they subsequently fled to Hiketas at Leontini and were done to death by him (*Plut. Tim. 33, Dion, 58*). If he had been alive during these transactions, his name must have been mentioned.

The only possible supposition is that his death had actually occurred before that of Dion. There may have been even at the time some doubt about the circumstances, as there often is about tragedies in high life. It may have been, as Aelian's story implies, an accident; and gossip may have converted the accident into a suicide and then embellished it with details, disparaging to Dionysios and illustrative of the fortitude of Dion. But it would not be sound criticism to dismiss the whole incident as fiction, because Plutarch and others are fond of telling a good story.

Plato, however, certainly wrote under the impression that Dion's son was alive. If there were reason to believe that he had trustworthy evidence before him, the historical difficulty would be serious. So long as people believed that the 7th Epistle was preceded by a letter to Plato from the friends of Dion, the difficulty was serious. But if we regard that letter as a literary fiction, the problem is at once simplified.

Plutarch's narrative implies that the interval between the death of Dion's

son and the crime of Kallippos was a short one. Affairs at Syracuse were in a highly disturbed state; it is at least probable that no communication was sent to Athens during this interval; and after Dion's murder, as we have seen, the correspondence must have been at once stopped by Kallippos. It may have been renewed, somewhat tardily, after the Dionean party had removed to Leontini and formed their coalition with Hipparinos and Dionysios, whose ships must have been the means of forwarding any communication sent. But need we suppose that the letters of the friends of Dion would, at that time, necessarily refer to the son of Dion, who had been removed from the scene several months before? They would be full of their own attempted operations and other matters which, like the death of Eudemos, belonged to the present. There is no improbability in supposing that the death of Dion's son was left unmentioned, and that Plato wrote the 8th Epistle in complete ignorance that such an event had taken place. If then we give to the 8th Epistle its proper date, the historical difficulty is removed.

One question remains, which may now be approached on the supposition that Plato, when he wrote the 7th Epistle, had not heard of the death of Dion's son: Who is the Hipparinos mentioned at the beginning of that letter? Is he Dion's nephew, or his son, who bore the same name? The passage runs as follows: 'When I made my first visit to Sicily, being then about forty years old, Dion was of the same age as Hipparinos is now, and the opinion which he then formed was that which he always retained—I mean, the belief that the Syracusans ought to be free and governed by the best laws. So it is no matter for surprise, if some god should make Hipparinos adopt the same opinion as Dion about the forms of government.'

At the time of Plato's first visit to Sicily, Dion was about twenty years old. The Hipparinos referred to must, therefore, have been a person of about twenty when the letter was written. Dion's son, at the time of his death, is said by Plutarch to have been *dvirītauſ*, i.e. about eighteen years of age. Now Plato had been on very intimate terms with the family during his second and third visits to Syracuse. He must have known Dion's son well; but he would not have the same precise knowledge of his age which the boy's mother had. Six years had elapsed since his return to Athens, and it is not at all impossible that he figured to himself the youth of eighteen as a young man of about twenty, especially if he wished to emphasize a parallelism between the son and his father.

On the other hand, there are serious difficulties in the way, if we suppose the other Hipparinos to be referred to as a young man of about twenty. He, too, must have been well known to Plato, and the circumstances of his birth were peculiar. Dionysios the Elder, who had lost his first wife, married on one day in 398 B.C. two wives, Doris the Lokrian, and Aristomache, daughter of his partisan, the elder Hipparinos. One of his titles to be considered a born ruler is the fact that he managed this quaint household successfully. Doris bore him a son without delay, Dionysios the Younger; but Aristomache remained for some years childless. Dionysios, suspecting that this was due to the drugs

or incantations of the mother of Doris, took effective steps for the removal of this troublesome mother-in-law (Plut. *Dion*, 3). At some subsequent date—we are not told when—Aristomache bore him four children, two sons and two daughters (*l.c.* 6). Hipparinos was the elder of the two sons, but we do not know whether he was older or younger than his sisters. If he was the person referred to in this passage, he must have been born not much less than twenty-four years after his mother's marriage, and she must subsequently have given birth to at least one other child. This is not a physical impossibility; but it is much more likely that the interval of Aristomache's childlessness was shorter, and that her elder son in 354 B.C. was a man of about thirty. It is therefore simpler to suppose that the Hipparinos here mentioned was Dion's son; and there is nothing in the passage itself which renders this at all unlikely. Language produces different effects on different minds. But surely most readers must feel it more probable that the two persons of whom Plato is here speaking are, not uncle and nephew, but father and son.

NOTE ON THE RELATION BETWEEN THE 7TH PLATONIC EPISTLE AND
THE SPEECH OF ISOKRATES ON THE ANTIDOSIS.

Post (*Thirteen Epistles*, p. 58) rightly emphasizes the close connexion between these two works, which belong to the same year, 354/3 B.C. Both are Apologies in the form of autobiographies, and the connexion between Plato and Dion has something in common with that which Isokrates claims to have existed between himself and Timotheos. Some of Post's points are overpressed. It is going too far to say that Isokrates twists Plato with the civil strife and executions that followed from Dion's success.

We may, however, take it as fairly certain that one of the two works inspired the other; and if, as shown above, it is probable on other grounds that the 7th Epistle was in circulation in the early part of 353 B.C., it is most likely that it was the source of inspiration. Other indications point in the same direction. Isokrates had not the same pressing reasons for an *Apologia* as Plato. There is nothing in the 7th Epistle which can be construed into a reference to Isokrates, while unmistakeable references to Plato and his school abound in the Speech on the Antidosis. Quite an appreciable part of that work may not unfairly be described as an attempt on the part of Isokrates to justify his own career and activities as against those of Plato. Both works have a fictitious setting; but their methods of handling the fiction are different, each being characteristic of its author. Plato leaves the reader to find out for himself the little mystification about the letter from the Dionean party, while Isokrates begins by revealing his secret and making sure that his readers are under no mistake about it.

J. HARWARD.

WARWICK, QUEENSLAND.

ES

removal of
date—we
and two
we do not
the person
in twenty-
have given
but it is
s shorter,
therefore
son; and
language
ers must
king are,

C AND

nnexion
Both are
en Plato
to have
pressed.
rife and

inspired
the 7th
y that it
rection.

There
okrates,
Speech
fairly be
eer and
ng; but
ristic of
fication
ling his

WARD.

THE OFFERINGS OF THE HYPERBOREANS.

AUTHORITIES on Apollo and Apollo cults are still divided into two camps. Some believe the god to have been Anatolian—Homeric god of the Troad, god of Branchidae and Lycia, a hawk-god, Smintheus, Lykios, with a western outpost at Carian-Ionian Delos, worshipped too in Crete, whence he passed to Pytho. In the other camp Apollo is, at least in part, believed to be a northerner, fair-haired, descending on Greece from the land of the Hyperboreans, the people 'Behind the Beyond.' And the mainstay of those who claim a partially northern origin for Apollo is in tales which both at Delos and at Delphi link him with the Hyperboreans.

Now it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss whether Apollo may have begun life as a sparrow-hawk or a mouse, as a black-poplar or an apple. Its purpose is rather first to attempt to give some sort of historical setting, not indeed to the Hyperboreans, but to the Hyperborean offerings; and secondly to indicate that the existence of these offerings, and of the fairy-tales about Hyperboreans, does not necessarily militate against acceptance of the belief that Apollo is in origin an Asiatic rather than a northerner.

On the historical side let us summarize the evidence. Homer does not mention Hyperboreans. Mountains to the north and people beyond them do not interest the Greeks of Asia Minor who find mystery rather in blameless Aethiopians. Hesiod (*circa* 750 B.C.) did mention them, according to Herodotus IV. 32, but the passage is lost. Hyperboreans to the north were for Boeotians the counterpart of Aethiopians to the east for Greeks of Asia Minor. The next mention of them is in Alcaeus (*circa* 600 B.C.), paraphrased by Himerios, who already gives the Delphic myth about them. Pindar follows with the celebrated passages in the 10th Pythian (498 B.C.) and the 3rd Olympian Ode (476 B.C.). The myth in these is Delphic again, though the 'Back of Beyond' is no farther away than the Danube. Next comes Herodotus with the famous passage (Book IV. 33), written probably about 450 B.C., concerning the Hyperborean offerings at Delos. This is a Delian tale, partly fanciful, partly falling within the realm of history and geography, more free from myth than anything Delphic. Later writers mainly elaborate the Delphic fairy-tales, pushing, as geographical knowledge expands, the Hyperboreans ever farther away until they are landed in Scandinavia.

One later writer, however, gives an historical touch, Pausanias. Quoting some earlier writer, Phanodemus probably, who wrote, as we learn from Athenaeus, on the subject of Erysichthon and Delos,¹ he describes a route for the Hyperborean offerings, which, set beside and contrasted with the Herodotean route, has produced much discussion.

In effect, then, Delphi, from about 600 B.C., was saying: Apollo, equipped

¹ Müller, *F.H.G.* I. 366. 1. Phanodemus cannot be dated earlier than the fourth century B.C.

with a chariot drawn by swans, was ordered by Zeus to drive to Delphi, but betook himself instead to the Hyperboreans. Having given laws to these ageless and griefless folk in the north, he was called to Delphi by a paean and song. Whenever he was absent from Pytho he was resident in the Hyperborean land, a kind of northern Delphi. In both he had a shrine of beeswax and feathers. For the three darkest winter months Apollo was not in Delphi, but in the far north, where he, strangely enough, enjoyed continuous sunshine.

By contrast with all this Delos, about 450 B.C., was saying: Sacred offerings wrapped in straw are sent to us by the Hyperboreans, who hand them to the Scythians. The offerings pass west from tribe to tribe to the Adriatic, thence south to Dodona, Malea, through Euboea to Carytos, Tenos, to Delos. Formerly two maidens, Hyperoche and Laodice, brought these offerings, stayed and died in Delos. Their *σῆμα*, over which grows an olive tree, is in the precinct of Artemis, on the left as you enter. Youths and brides deposit shorn locks on the *σῆμα*. But two earlier Hyperborean maidens, Opis and Arge, came long before the other two. They are buried in a *θήκη* behind the precinct of Artemis, to the east, quite close to the Ceian dining-hall. Delians, Islanders, and Ionians sing a hymn to these two ascribed to the Lycian poet Olen.

Both pairs of tombs, *σῆμα* and *θήκη*, have been found in Delos by the French excavators, in the very places described by Herodotus, proving incidentally that his description is that of a traveller who has been to the spot himself. But the discovery of these tombs, described by Picard and Replat,¹ has finally dissolved any shadow of historic reality that the maidens could ever have claimed. Both groups of burials were of the Bronze age, and contained Cycladic, Middle Minoan II.-III., and Late Minoan II. pottery.

As Nilsson has pointed out,² the primitive tombs had a cult attached to them in the Cycladic and Mycenaean age. The inhabitants of the tombs were forgotten, the sanctity of the tomb remained, and later on degraded deities or imaginary heroines were associated with the spot.

But if the Hyperborean maidens cancel out, the offerings remain, and the curious route by which they are said to have come compels attention. In fact, it may be assumed that the offerings really came, but that the Delian priests of Apollo were either ignorant of the identity of the senders, or, knowing it, chose to suppress it in order to heighten the atmosphere of mystery.

At the other end, however, it may be assumed that the senders of those offerings not only knew of Delian Apollo, but held him in such high regard that they willingly took some trouble to forward offerings to him. It is improbable that such people were pure barbarians, devoid of all Hellenic connexions. May it not be possible that they were the descendants of Greeks and of Apollo-worshipping Greeks who held Delos in special reverence?

In Eastern Greece the sanctuary next in importance to Delos was the Milesian shrine at Branchidae. Miletus, as is well known, founded all the

¹ In *B.C.H.*, 1924, p. 247

² *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*, p. 536.

most important colonies round the Euxine; Sinope *circa* 800 B.C., Istrus 656, Tyras 656, Olbia 647, Panticapaeum *circa* 550 B.C., and numerous others.

At each of these cities Apollo was the centre of the principal cult.¹ To Professor Minns we are indebted for his valuable collection of material concerning Tyras and Olbia; but they lie to the north of the Danube mouths. Istrus, to the south, is outside the scope of his work, and for information on that city we must turn to the late Professor Parvan.

In his paper on *La Pénétration Hellénique et Hellénistique dans la Vallée du Danube*, read before the fifth Historical Congress in 1923 at Brussels, he has a good deal to tell of Istrus, its Apollo-cult and its relations with the Danube basin, and his account of the numerous finds of Greek objects of the sixth, fifth, and later centuries is remarkable.

More than that, Parvan has drawn attention to the existence of an actual Greek settlement up the Danube at Bärboşı, founded about the middle of the sixth century B.C., with tombs containing black-figured Attic vases. Bärboşı lies at the junction of the Sereth and Danube, over one hundred miles by water from the Black Sea. Over two hundred miles up the great river was another settlement—Heraclea-Axiopolis, which goes back at least to the fifth century, since Electrum Cyzicenes have been found there; and beyond that traces of Greek penetration are abundant, coins of Istrus and Mesembria, Ionian bronze vessels of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., and many other objects having turned up hundreds of miles inland from the city of Istrus.

The Danubian trade was, according to the same authority, the monopoly of Istrus which Herodotus apparently did not trouble to visit, relying for his information on reports collected in Olbia and Tyras. Had he visited Istrus he might have given a truer and more accurate account of the great river. It is conceivable that he might even have heard something more of the dispatch of offerings to Delos.

From the seventh to the fifth centuries the Istrians are presumed to have been the only Greeks who went up the Danube, but, like the Greeks of the northern Black Sea coast, they tended to mingle with the natives. Tymnes, a Caro-Scythian half-breed, an Olbiopolite and the informant of Herodotus (IV. 76), was perhaps typical;² and just as most of the Olbiopolitae were probably Greco-Scythians, so the Istrians appear to have been largely Greco-Getae. One may suspect that these Mix-hellenes, or half-breeds, went to populate the little Istrian settlements far up the Danube, and that these same half-breeds carried Greek merchandise far into the Carpatho-Danubian countries from the sixth century B.C. onwards. May it not be the case that such semi-barbarized descendants of Istrian, that is ultimately Milesian-Ionian, stock may have wished to keep in touch, spasmodically at least, with the great Ionian sanctuary in Delos, of which Greek sailors coming to the Danube mouths would have something to tell? After the Ionian Revolt, anyhow, Delos was

¹ For Sinope, cf. Coins, *Z.f.N.* XX. 272. For capaeum, Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, pp. 476, 616. Istrus, Parvan, *Dacia*, p. 84. For Olbia, Panti-

² Cf. How and Wells, *Commentary on Hdt.* I. 330.

supreme, for there was no longer an Apolline sanctuary at Branchidae with which contact might have been maintained.¹ Did scattered Mix-hellenes from the Danube valley perhaps really send the so-called Hyperborean offerings to Delos?

If this were the case, how should the Herodotean route for the offerings be explained? The account of this route by reason of its very strangeness carries the stamp of truth, and is to be contrasted with the description of the other route perhaps culled by Pausanias from the pages of the Attidographer Phanodemus. Here the itinerary runs Hyperboreans, Arimaspians, Issedones (these two mythical communities have the air of being inserted from Herodotus IV. 27 in order to push the Hyperboreans farther away), Scythians, Sinope, Attic Prasiae, Delos.

Now Parvan, discussing the Carpatho-Danubians and Villanovans, has pointed out that imports poured from Northern Italy and Illyria into the Danube basin down to the end of the sixth century B.C.² Consequently the trade-route up the river and across to the head of the Adriatic was a perfectly normal one.³ Nevertheless the route down the river to the Black Sea commends itself as the more simple, even though Sinope, a station on the route, appears to lie needlessly far to the south-east to call for inclusion. In the fifth and fourth centuries, however, commercial relations between Olbia, Istrus, and Sinope must have been specially intimate—a fact deducible from the uniformity of their principal coin-type, a sea-eagle on a dolphin.⁴ Accordingly the inclusion of Sinope need occasion no surprise.

It might even be suggested that the Black Sea route for the offerings was the original sixth-century route, if the offerings were already sent in that century; that the expedition of Darius into Scythia in 516 B.C., and the consequent turmoil and insecurity, as well as the knowledge that Persia now controlled Bosphorus and Hellespont, led to the deliberate choice of the Adriatic route which persisted far into the fifth century. This, however, is a guess. But it is possible to suggest with more confidence a reason for the later diversion of the offerings from the Herodotean Adriatic route to the Istrus, Sinope route. Parvan, dealing with the Carpatho-Danubians and Celts, pointed out that the pressure of the incoming Celts from the west began first to make itself felt in the Dacian region between 400 and 300 B.C., when burials containing La Tène I. objects begin to appear. In fact, in the first half of the fourth century B.C. the Celtic invasion from Southern Germany would appear to have placed a wide barrier across the Danube-Adriatic trade-route with such effect that Danubian exports could no longer pass westwards and would have to travel east to the Black Sea. Herodotus, about 450 B.C., still knew about the

¹ If Milesian colonies sent θεωπαι and offerings to the shrines and festivals which were the objects of Milesian cult, they were only carrying out a practice customary in all Athenian colonies; cf. Scholia in Aristoph. *Nub.* 386; Hicks and Hill, *Greek Hist. Inscrīp.*, No. 41, 11 to 13.

² *Dacia*, p. 19, which I quote in advance by the courtesy of the translators Mr. I. L. Evans and

Mr. M. P. Charlesworth.

³ See also Brandis on 'Danuvius' in *P.W.* IV. 2, 2127, 34 sqq.

⁴ Olbia: B. Pick, *Ant. Munz. N. Griechenlands I.*, Pl. IX., 9 to 11, 20; Istrus: Pl. II., 20 to 26; Sinope: B.M.C. *Pontus, etc.*, Pls. XXI., 15 to 17, XXII., 1 to 7.

wes
Pau
the
half

that
actu
are
unsa

Get
Thr
Gre
cont
Pyth

are
com
jeal
orac
by e
anno
do s

the
Deli
too,
voya

be n
origi

geog
they
behin
Mile

Delo
Hyp

¹ T
port
Navas

western route: Phanodemus, if his *Atthis* was the text-book from which Pausanias quoted, wrote of the eastern route which was probably employed at the time when Istrus and Sinope shared a coin type, that is to say in the first half of the fourth century B.C.

Neither the one route nor the other, then, is incompatible with the suggestion that the senders of the offerings may have dwelt along the Danube, where Pindar actually located his mythical Hyperboreans, while if the senders of the offerings are to be sought farther afield we have to fall back upon the well-known, but unsatisfactory, 'Amber-route' hypothesis.¹

Having suggested that the senders of the offerings were possibly Greco-Getae, one may add one point about the Getae themselves, for this tribe of Thraco-Scythians had, according to Herodotus (IV. 93 to 96), come under some Greek influences and believed in immortality. Here at least is a point of contact² between the Getae and the mythical Hyperboreans of Pindar's 10th Pythian whom old age never touches.

The second point is a short one.

If the Hyperborean link with Delos is to be thus simply explained, what are we to say about Delphi and its Hyperborean legends? How did Delphi come to have these myths? It appears that Delphi was always somewhat jealous of the more venerable Delos. The former had the advantage of the great oracle, but the latter was the birthplace of the god. The jealousy was fanned by external influences even in the sixth century, for when Peisistratus sought to annoy the Delphian protectors of the Alcmaeonidae he found that he could best do so by exalting and enriching Delos.

It seems that not only the graves of supposed Hyperborean maidens, but the recurrent arrival of the offerings added not a little to the reputation of the Delian god. Perhaps the Delphians naively said, 'We must have Hyperboreans too,' and to that end elaborated extant fairy-tales and invented the annual voyage of their god to the land of the serene people at the 'Back of Beyond.'

If this were the explanation of the Delphic Hyperborean tales there would be no reason to seek any longer for a northern, or even a partially northern, origin for Apollo.

I end with a summary:

The suggestion is that the people who sent the offerings to Delos were geographically 'Hyperborean,' but not racial or mythical Hyperboreans; that they are less likely to have been the barbarian proto-Hellenic parent-stock left behind in Central Europe, than the semi-barbarized descendants of Ionian-Milesian traders located in the south of Central Europe.

The second suggestion is that pro-Dorian Delphi, jealous of pro-Ionian Delos and its honourable Hyperborean connexions, proceeded to construct Hyperborean myths for its own glory.

C. T. SELTMAN.

¹ This well-known hypothesis receives no support from the exhaustive researches of J. M. de Navarro, 'Prehistoric Routes between N. Europe and Italy defined by the Amber Trade,' *Geogr. Journ.*, 1925, pp. 481 sqq.

² As Kazarow, *Klio* XII., p. 357, has realized.

ALEXANDER OF ABONUTEICHOS.

Βάκχου προφήτης in *Rhes.* 972 has of late been discussed at length.¹ It may be of service to say something on a parallel to his position as an ἀνθρωποδάίμον who voices the oracles of a god; I refer to Alexander of Abonuteichos. Alexander was the prophet of the divine serpent Glycon, giving oracles which purported to come from Glycon. At the same time, he received honours himself; according to Lucian's ironical statement these were twice as great as those paid to Glycon.² Again, after his death he appears to have been honoured as divine; while the supposed evidence for his cult at Parion will hardly bear investigation,³ there is a dedication at Blace-Uskub in Illyria, *Iou Iunoni et draccon[i] et draccae et Alexandro*, which probably refers to him and couples him in honour with the sacred snake and its otherwise unknown consort.⁴ When Alexander died his chief subordinates asked Rutilianus, his distinguished Roman disciple, to decide which of them should fill the vacant office of prophet. Rutilianus sent them away disappointed; the office of prophet, which had been Alexander's in life, was to remain his in death.⁵ The cultus seems to have continued: Glycon appears on coins of Nicomedia as well as on coins of Abonuteichos, now called Ionopolis at Alexander's wish, and on the latter he is in evidence almost till the mint was closed.⁶ That oracles continued to be given is not certain but likely. The shrine was a prosperous concern, and any who cared for the welfare of Abonuteichos could not lightly let it die.⁷ If oracles were still given, they were given as coming from Alexander the prophet of Glycon.

He is clearly comparable with the ἀνθρωποδάίμον on Pangaeum. How did Alexander form his conception of his position? Or, if we regard him as an impostor, on what elements in contemporary thought did he rely to support his claims? A main constituent is no doubt the Pythagorean revival, which had not yet spent its

¹ Ridgeway, *C.Q.* XX, 17 sqq.; A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Dithyramb Tragedy and Comedy*, 182 sqq.; Nock, *C.R.*, 1926, 184 sqq.

² *Alexander*, 24.

³ Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis*, 26, while polemizing against idolatry, says: τοῦ τοίνυν δόλους μὲν εἰναι τοῦ ἐπεργούντας, ἐφ' ἔτρων δὲ ἀνίστασθαι τὰς εἰκόνας, ἐκεῖνο μέγιστον τεκμήριον, Τρώας καὶ Πάριον· η μὲν Νερυλλίνου εἰκόνας ἔχει—ό ἀνήρ τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς—τὸ δὲ Πάριον Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Πιρωτέως· τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐτι ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ δὲ τάφος καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν· οἱ μὲν οὖν δόλοι αὐτῶν τοῦ Νερυλλίνου κοσμημάτων εἰσὶ δημόσιοι, ἐπερ καὶ τούτοις κοσμεῖται τὸν τόπον, εἰς δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ χρηματίζειν καὶ λαζαθεὶς νοούντας νομίζεται, καὶ θύουσι τε δι' αὐτὸν καὶ περιαλειφούσιν καὶ στεφανούσιν χρυσῷ τὸν ἀνδράντα οἱ Τρωαῖς. οἱ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ δὲ τοῦ Πιρωτέως (τούτον δὲ οὐκ ἀγορεύει πίγαντα ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὸ πῦρ), οἱ μὲν καὶ αὐτὸς λέγεται χρηματίζειν, τῷ δὲ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου—‘δύσπαρι, εἶδος δριστε, γυναιμανές’—δημοτελεῖς δύονται θυσίαι καὶ ἐστρατεία θεῷ. Proteus is Lucian's Proteus, a native of Parium, and it has been urged by Cumont, Geffcken, Weinreich, and A. Stein that Alexander is our hero. But the τάφος is inexplicable; why should A. have a tomb or cenotaph in Parion? It is far more probable that Paris is meant, as Athenagoras himself implies; this has, I find, been suggested by Fr. Pfister, *Reliquienkult im Altertum*, 286, who refers to Suid, s.v. Πάριον and Joann. Antioch, fr. 93, in *F.H.G.* IV, 550, for the

story that Priam sent Paris to live there till he had completed his thirtieth year and the peril threatened in it to Troy was averted. (In Joannes Malalas, p. 92 Dindorf; and Cedrenus, p. 216 Bekker; Priam founds Parion for Paris.) It may be conjectured that this image and its cult are products of Hellenistic or Imperial antiquarianism.

⁴ Dessau, *Inscr. lat. sel.* 4080; cf. O. Weinreich, *Neue Jahrb.*, 1921, 143 sq. What follows is in the nature of a supplement to his admirable paper.

⁵ Ch. 60. αὐτῷ τὴν προφητείαν διαφυλάττων μετὰ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἀπαλλαγὴν. His death can be fixed as before 175 (A. Stein, *Strena Buliciana*, 257 sqq.).

⁶ Babelon-Reinach-Waddington, *Recueil général des monnaies d'Asie Mineure*, I. 167 sqq.; Weinreich, 148 sqq.

⁷ The spirit of the Ephesians, in Acts xix., illustrates the point. H. Scholze, *De temporibus librorum Themistii* (Diss. Göttingen; 1911), 72, argues from Themist. Orat. XXVII, p. 401, Dindorf, that the oracle continued to operate till shortly before the delivery of that speech, which he places in A.D. 355. This is unfortunately illusory. Them. refers first to a local Paphlagonian healing sanctuary of Asklepios, and then says: τι δὲ εἰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ δεκθέντες ἐτύχομεν διλγον πρότερον χρόνον, ἥπικα ἐν γειτόνων τὴν μαντικὴν ἐπεδείκνυτο; the reference is therefore

force.

Pytha-

distinc-

rôle is

Lucia-

Amph-

remain-

with a

Perse-

of Po-

Selene-

On

regula-

adding

and pr-

saints,

and li-

antiqu-

have a

that the

man.⁹

to an u-

not to th-

Kleinasi-

coin str-

ing a sm-

ΓΑΤΚΩ

to the g-

if not a

coins, a

man, is

Gordian

holding

160, No

question

¹ So

202 sqq.

² Aris-

φας, fr.

kratiker

Pythag-

έστι θεός

the dist-

ascribed

Vita VII

γηρονε-

ander v-

townsm-

³ Alex-

shrine o-

⁴ Alex-

have or

Wissowa-

times re-

with lea-

this idea

But the

marriage

force.¹ Alexander, like Pythagoras, had a golden thigh, which he exhibited; like Pythagoras he might be thought to belong to a special category of rational beings distinct from gods and men.² At the same time, it may be suggested that Alexander's rôle is in part shaped by a traditional type of heroic *μάντης* localized in Asia Minor. Lucian says of the founding of the oracle that Alexander 'took the note from Amphilochus in Cilicia'; in addition to Amphilochus, Mopsus also and Calchas remained in memory if not in practice.³ Clearly Alexander hedged himself around with any available forms of sanctity; he was descended from Podaleirius and from Perseus, the latter chosen perhaps as the supposed ancestor of the old ruling house of Pontus; again, in the mysteries he founded he appeared as the bridegroom of Selene, and he claimed to have a daughter by her.⁴

One pretension made by Alexander deserves particular attention. Glycon regularly put off people's hopes and expectations of advancement and inheritances, adding: 'You will have all when I will it and my prophet Alexander asks it of me and prays on your behalf.'⁵ Alexander is therefore an intercessor, like the Christian saints, as we find them invoked in third-century *graffiti*; *Paule et Petre, petite pro nobis*, and like the saints and prophets of Islam.⁶ Strict parallels are not common in antiquity. We have *iam prece Pollucis, iam Castoris implorata* in Catullus 68. 65;⁷ we have also requests to the dead to pray on behalf of the living,⁸ and we find the belief that the prayers of a righteous man carry more weight than those of an unrighteous man.⁹ Again, the Egyptian priest who asks pardon for his penitent's offences in

to an unknown neighbouring oracle of Apollo, not to that of Asklepios-Glycon. Imhoof-Blumer, *Kleinasienische Münzen*, I. 31, No. 4, published a coin struck at Pergamon under Gordian, showing a snake *r.* and the magistrate's name, Γ. ΚΑ. ΓΑΤΚΩΝ, and suggested that the snake alluded to the god Glycon; the snake is however an old, if not a common, Asklepios type on Pergamene coins, and ΚΑ. ΓΑΤΚΩΝ, presumably the same man, is named on another Pergamene coin under Gordian with the familiar type of Asklepios holding a snake-entwined staff (*B. M. C. Mysia*, 160, No. 341). The allusion is possible but questionable.

¹ So Cumont, *Rev. hist. rel.* LXXXVI. (1922), 202 sqq.

² Aristotle, in his *Περὶ τῆς Πυθαγορικῆς φιλοσοφίας*, fr. 187, in the Berlin ed. (=Diels, *Vorsokratiker*⁴, I. 29. 27), records as an esoteric Pythagorean distinction, *τοῦ λογικοῦ ζωοῦ τὸ μὲν ἔστι θέος, τὸ δὲ ἀνθρωπος, τὸ δὲ οὐν Πυθαγόρας*. Cf. the distinction, possibly based on this, which is ascribed to Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus, *Vita VIII. 7. 9*, *θεοὶ μὲν γάρ μελλοντον, ἀνθρωποι δὲ γιγνομένων, σοφοὶ δὲ προσίντων αἰσθάνονται*. Alexander was a disciple of a pupil and fellow-townsman of Apollonius (Lucian, *Alex.* 5).

³ *Alex.* 19. (There was a mysterious oracular shrine of Calchas in Apulia.)

⁴ *Alex.* 39, 35. The Endymion story seems to have originated in Asia Minor (Bethe, *Pauly-Wissowa*, V. 2558). Endymion is in Hellenistic times regarded as a sage whom Selene endowed with learning by her visitations (Plut. *Numa*, 4); this idea may be a factor in Alexander's story. But the chief explanation is perhaps that marriage with a goddess may confer a sort of

deity; Menelaus goes to Elysium because of the divine birth of his wife Helen. (A Neopythagorean allegorical meaning is found in the story by Cumont, *l.c.* 209.)

⁵ *Alex.* 22. *τὰς μέντοι ἀλπίδας καὶ προκοτὰς καὶ κλήρους διαδοχάς εἰσαῦτις δεὶ ἀνεβάλλετο, προστίθεται ὅτι ἔσται ἀπαντα, ὅπεραν ἔθελήσω ἔγω, καὶ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ προφήτης μου δενθῆ καὶ προσεκέηται ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.*

⁶ The Christian parallel needs no detailed illustration: on the prayers of the saints in connexion with the liturgy cf. St. Cyril of Jerusalem in F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, I. 466. 9, *εἴτα μυημονέουμεν καὶ τῶν προκομημένων πάρον πατριαρχῶν προφητῶν ἀποστόλων μαρτύρων δπως ὁ Θεός ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείας προσέξηται ἡμῶν τὴν δέσσων* (this represents Palestinian custom in A.D. 348). On the Mohammedan parallel cf. Chr. Snouck-Hurgronje in Bertholet-Lehmann, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*, I. 733.

⁷ Cf. Usener, *Kleine Schriften*, IV. 311 sqq., for an epigraphic illustration. In *Archiv. für lat. Lex.* II. 231 he explains Plut. *Cur Pythia nunc non 20*, p. 404A, *εἰ τις εἴη παράκλησις η λόσις* as meaning *εἰ τις γένετο θέος παράκλητος*; but *παράκλησις* can be 'mode of asking pardon,' cf. Strabo XIII. 1. 1, p. 581, and Stephanus Dindorf, *Thes.* VI. 288D.

⁸ Cf. H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs*, 120 sqq.; for the invocation of ancestors as intercessors by less developed peoples cf. F. Heiler, *Das Gebet*⁵, 126 sqq., 574.

⁹ Terence, *Adelphi* 703, *abi pater, | tu potius deos comprecare; nam tibi eos certo scio | quo uir melior multo es quam ego, obtemperaturos magis*, which deserves to be quoted in illustration of the Epistle of James v. 16, *πολὺ λογίει δέσσοις δικαίοις ἐπεργομένη*.

Juvenal VI. 535-541 is as it were the official channel for such petitions: in countless ways a priest or prophet acts in this representative capacity.¹ This is hardly Alexander's position. Nor is that really illustrated by the theory of the mediation of *daemones* propounded in Plato's *Symposium* and developed by later writers; the *daemones* there hold the lines of communication between heaven and earth, and their mediation avoids the supposition of any infringement of God's transcendence. They are in fact parallel to the angels of later Jewish thought, and the driving forces in both developments are comparable.²

Alexander is a friend at court, who has the ear of Glycon, and can give or withhold aid. He is a mediator of this kind in virtue of his proprietary interest in Glycon; as both introducing and representing the new cult, he stands between humanity and Glycon.³ In this possessive aspect he is really more akin to the medicine-man in an undeveloped community or to the Christian who converts such a community, and the patron saint within his own area,⁴ than to the saints as elsewhere invoked for particular purposes. It is this essential characteristic of the ownership of a new revelation which causes the similarity between Alexander and such Gnostics as Simon Magus and Markos. They belong to a common type, a type to which their adherents applied the name *προφήτης* and their enemies *γόνης*.⁵ Perhaps nowhere does their proprietary position appear more clearly than in the well-known story in Acts of Simon's request to the Apostles that they should sell to him the gift of the Spirit. When St. Peter replied *τὸ ἀργύριον σου σὺν σοὶ εἶναι εἰς ἀπάλειαν*, and urged him to repent, Simon is made to say *Δεήθητε ὑμεῖς ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ πρὸς τὸν Κύριον, ὅπως μηδὲν ἐπέλθῃ ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὃν εἰρήκατε* (8. 24). This implies not merely the common fear of the effectiveness of the spoken word or curse, but also the notion that St. Peter and St. John have proprietary rights in the new revelation and are in a position to employ its mysterious forces against him. Alexander remains an example of peculiar interest, because we can see him operating with Greek or Hellenized material, presenting his sacred story in a visible way in his mysteries,⁶ and leaving a lasting result; he did so because he built on local belief and because he created an institution which could take firm root.

A. D. NOCK.

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

¹ Aristides, *eis τὸν Σάραπιν* (Vol. I., p. 83, Dindorf), says that we have left the function of addressing the gods to the poets, *ώστερ προφήτης* *ως ἀληθῶς οὐσι τῶν θεῶν*. On the term *προφήτης* cf. E. Fascher, *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ* (Giessen, 1927). On the position of priests in Greece in general cf. L. Ziehen, *Pauly-Wissowa*, VIII. 1421 sqq.

² Cf. H. Schmidt, *Vetus philosophi quomodo iudicaverint de precibus* (*Relg. Vers. Vorarb.* IV. 1, 141; H. Gressmann, *Religion des Judentums*³, 330 sqq. Dr. A. B. Cook has kindly drawn my attention to Assyrian and Babylonian analogies; cf. Br. Meissner, *Babylonian and Assyrian*, II. 79, 136, 207. The analogy of royal courts on earth must have had its share in promoting the conception of a heavenly hierarchy, both in the ancient East and in the Hellenistic monarchies; cf. *J.H.S.* XLV. 97.

³ It is interesting to notice that the fact that Sophocles was made a hero (Dexion) after his death is by the tradition brought into relation with his 'reception' of Asklepios; cf. F. Kutsch, *Attische Heilgötter und Heilheroen* (*Relg. Vers. Vorarb.* XIII. iii.), 13 and 22.

⁴ As, for instance, St. Nicholas in Lycia (some

striking quotations in G. Anrich, *Hagios Nikolas*, II. 496 sqq.). Cf. the development of Mohammedan belief concerning the Prophet away from his more modest conception of his place (Snouck-Hurgronje, *l.c.* 674).

⁵ So Reitzenstein has remarked; cf. Fascher, *op. cit.*, *passim* for references. Fascher makes it clear that *προφήτης* is normally combined with the name of a deity in the genitive; it does not usually stand alone like *μάρτυς*. One might expect to find Orpheus as a mediator; but Kuhnert's supposition that on certain Tarentine vases he is interceding for his dead initiates (*Arch. Jahrb.*, 1893, 104 sqq.) is not supported by other evidence, and has not found favour (cf. Furtwängler-Reichhold, *Griech. Vasenm. Textb.* I. 47 sqq., for references to later discussions).

⁶ Ch. 38 sqq. They are based on those of Eleusis, but more elaborate, and perhaps influenced by the contemporary pantomime. On the effectiveness of this active realization of the sacred story cf. Usener, *Kleine Schriften* IV. 422 sqq.; this instance is of peculiar interest because we can see the origin of a rite.

beer
cont
subj

fall
deal
symp
Boo
Boo
litera
Gree
XXV
Boo
inten
XXX

a wo
are s
'Eyk

in lat

Meteo
ἐν τοι
our I
381^b s
owing
έτερο
ence
Corpu

the A
can li
de res
life an
the su
IV. 1
passag

V
found
Proble

regard
He als

¹ The
paper re

THE PSEUDO-ARISTOTELIAN PROBLEMS: THEIR NATURE AND COMPOSITION.

THE *Problems*, which occupy pp. 859-967 of the Berlin Aristotle, have probably been less read and studied than any other treatise in the Aristotelian Corpus;¹ they contain, however, a vast quantity of interesting information on a great variety of subjects, and an enquiry into their composition may be not without interest.

The work consists of thirty-eight books, containing nearly 900 problems. They fall into several groups. Books I.-XI. form a medical and physiological group, dealing with medicine, perspiration, drunkenness, sexual intercourse, fatigue and sympathetic action. Books XII. and XIII. treat of odours, pleasant and unpleasant; Book XIV. with the effect of locality on temperament; Book XV. with mathematics; Books XVI. and XVII. with things animate and inanimate; Book XVIII. with literary study; Book XIX. with music (a *locus classicus* on the difficult subject of Greek music). Books XX. to XXII. form a botanical group; Books XXIII. to XXVI. a physical group, dealing with salt water, hot waters, the air and the winds. Books XXVII. to XXX. treat of moral qualities, fear and courage, temperance and intemperance, justice and injustice, and wisdom. Finally there is a group, Books XXXI. to XXXVIII., dealing with parts of the body.

That Aristotle himself wrote a book of *Problems* is clear from references to such a work both in other parts of the Aristotelian Corpus and in other authors. They are sometimes referred to as simply τὰ Προβλήματα, sometimes as τὰ Φυσικὰ, or τὰ Ἑγκύκλια Προβλήματα, occasionally as τὰ Ἐπιχειρήματα.

An examination of the reference to the *Problems* in the Aristotelian Corpus and in later writers throws some light on the composition of our *Problems*.

To take the references in Aristotle first—the most important is to be found in *Meteor II.*, 363^a 24, where the writer speaks of those phenomena ὅσα μὴ συμβέβηκεν ἐν τοῖς προβλήμασιν εἰρήσθαι τοῖς κατὰ μέρος. This appears to be a general reference to our *Problems*, Book XXVI., which deals with the winds. Again in *Meteor III.*, 381^b 9-15, where the writer is dealing with the formation of animal life in the body owing to the decay of uncooked matter, he says that this question is treated ἐν ἔρεσι, which Alexander Aphrodisiensis interprets as ἐν τοῖς Προβλήμασι. The reference here must be to XX. 12. Six other references to *Problems* in the Aristotelian Corpus cannot be brought into relation with our *Problems*.

There is also a certain number of references in our *Problems* to other works in the Aristotelian Corpus. In X. 67 it is stated that the question why some animals can live after their heads have been cut off is 'discussed elsewhere'—namely, in the *de respiratione* (475^a 20 sqq.); and in XX. 17, where the question why some forms of life are more long-lived than others is discussed, the writer says that 'this is to be the subject of another treatise'—an obvious reference to the *de long. et brev. vitae*. In IV. 18 there appears to be a direct reference to *de part. anim.* 658^b 19 sq. All these passages may certainly be regarded as Aristotelian.

We will next consider the references to the Aristotelian *Problems* which are to be found in other authors, and see how far they can be brought into relation with our *Problems*.

Plutarch (*Quaest. Coniuui.* iii. 3, iv. 1 and 9) refers to various opinions of Aristotle regarding salt water, which seems to show that he had Book XXIII. before him. He also (*ib.* iii. 8) paraphrases III. 2, on the troublesomeness of those who are only

¹ The best account of the *Problems* is still the paper read to the Bavarian Academy in 1850 by

C. Prantl (*Abhandlungen d. philos.-philol. Klasse d. Bayer. Akad.*, VI, p. 339 sqq.).

half drunk, citing Aristotle as his authority, and (*ib.* vi. 9) quotes III. 22, on the difficulty of washing stains of diluted wine out of garments.

Athenaeus (i. p. 55) quotes II. 2, which discusses why the limbs do not perspire under water, citing it as from the *Physical Problems* of Aristotle; he also refers similarly (in x., p. 434) to IV. 4, on the infertility of drunkards. On the other hand (in xv., p. 692) he quotes a problem on the topic *διὰ τί οἱ μυριζόμενοι πολιώτεροι*, which finds no place in our *Problems*.

Galen (*Epid.* vi. 3) quotes V. 31, on the tendency to ἔξονειρωμός of those who are suffering from fatigue or phthisis, as from the *Physical Problems* of Aristotle.

Apollonius (*de mirab.* 7) quotes XXI. 24, as to why bakers who handle barley become pale, while those who handle wheat are healthy; in *ib.* 22 he quotes X. 44, on wind in animals; in *ib.* 37 he quotes XIII. 10, on the breath of deformed persons; and in *ib.* 28 he quotes XXXII. 4, regarding the bitterness of the wax which forms in the ears. In all these passages he gives the *Physical Problems* of Aristotle as his authority. Three similar quotations cannot be brought into relation with our *Problems*.

Aulus Gellius, in the *Noctes Atticae*, cites the *Problems* of Aristotle eight times. Two of these quotations find no place in our *Problems*, the rest can be brought into direct relation with them. In ii. 3 Gellius gives a word for word translation of XXVI. 37, as to why the sea is blue when the wind is in the south, and black when it is in the north (incidentally enabling us to improve the text by reading *ἀταρακτότερον* from his *tranquillius* for the *ἀτακτότερον* of the MSS.). In XIX. 2 he gives a word for word quotation in Greek of XXVIII. 7 (a typically Aristotelian passage which deals at length with the question why the term 'incontinent' is applied only to those who indulge to excess in the pleasures of touch and taste) prefacing his quotation with the words: *uerba super hac re Aristotelis philosophi adscripti; ut uel auctoritas clari atque incluti uiri tam infamibus nos uoluptatibus deterret.* In xix. 4 Gellius, quoting from the *Physical Problems* of Aristotle, gives the substance of XXVII. 10, dealing with the effect of fear on the bodily functions, citing, however, the word *ψυχοποιητικόν* as occurring in the passage before him, though it is not found in our text. In the same chapter he partly translates VII. 3, on the effect on the bodily functions of standing in front of the fire. In xix. 4 Gellius refers to a problem of Aristotle dealing with the reason why shame causes blushing, while fear causes pallor; the exact form of this problem does not occur, but its doctrine is found in several passages in the *Problems*. Lastly he quotes in xx. 4 the problem of XXX. 10, treating of the reason why theatrical artists are generally bad men.

There is ample evidence also for the Aristotelian authorship of XXX. 1, the longest and most interesting problem in the whole collection. It deals with the connexion between the melancholic, or atrabilious, temperament and genius. 'Why is it,' it asks, 'that all those who have become eminent in philosophy, politics, poetry, and the arts are obviously of an atrabilious temperament?' The author cites as examples, Heracles, Ajax, Bellerophon, Lysander, Empedocles, Socrates, Plato, and most of the poets. This problem is definitely ascribed to Aristotle by Cicero (*Tusc. Disp.* i. 33): *Aristoteles quidem ait omnes ingeniosos melancholicos esse; ut ego me tardiorum esse non moleste feram. Enumerat multos, idque quasi constet, rationem, cur ita fiat, adfert.* The Aristotelian authorship of this problem is also supported by Plutarch (*vit. Lysandi*, 5).

Such are the instances where existing *Problems* are definitely quoted by other authors as Aristotelian. There is a rather larger number of citations ascribed to the *Problems* of Aristotle which do not occur in our *Problems*. There is, moreover, a very large number of passages where the doctrine of the *Problems* can be brought into connexion with other passages in the Aristotelian Corpus; for example, the doctrine of Book XIX. (on Music) agrees closely with such hints about his view on

this subject as Aristotle gives elsewhere, particularly in its insistence upon the ethical influence of music.

It seems, therefore, to follow that, firstly, there is in the *Problems* a considerable element derived from a genuine Aristotelian work called the *Φυσικὰ Προβλήματα*, but that the compiler of the existing work, whoever he was, had not access to the whole of the Aristotelian collection, or, if he had, did not make full use of it; and, secondly, the doctrine of the *Problems* is to a large extent Aristotelian.

Besides the Aristotelian element there are two other obvious sources used by the compiler. As in the Aristotelian treatises on animals, so in the *Problems* there is ample evidence of the influence of the Hippocratic writings, especially in the earlier books. This subject has been fully dealt with by Franz Poschenrieder.¹

Another important source is to be found in the writings of Theophrastus, a fact which was noted by Stephanus as long ago as 1557. Books II., V., XX., XXIV. and XXVI. are largely derived from the *Historiae Plantarum*, the *Causae Plantarum*, and the fragments on *Sweat, Fatigue, Fire, and the Winds*.

It must be confessed that the compiler has not used his material with much skill. The same problems occur in different books, and the same topics are treated in the same books in different forms. E. Richter² has made an elaborate study of the problems derived from Theophrastus, and has shown that the collection contains sometimes as many as four versions derived from the same passage of Theophrastus. One version is an almost verbal copy; a second is made by varying the original, sometimes by lengthening it, sometimes by shortening it; a third disregards the form of the original and recasts the material in a different shape, usually shorter than the original; a fourth version states the problem and its solution in the shortest possible form, and is probably derived not from Theophrastus but from one of the later versions just mentioned.

Further, the collection as it stands contains not infrequently contradictions of doctrine; for example, shrillness of voice is said in one passage (903^a, 29 sqq.) to be due to weakness, in another (901^a, 31 sqq.) to violence; in one passage (932^b, 8 sqq.) the sea is said to be more transparent than fresh water, in another (934^a, 18-19) not to be transparent at all. A very long list of such minor contradictions can easily be formed.³ In short, the compiler seems to have had as his object the collection of as many problems as possible without being greatly at pains to harmonize them into a consistent and logical whole.

To sum up, the *Problems* appear to consist, firstly, of an Aristotelian element, derived in part from the genuine *Φυσικὰ Προβλήματα* of Aristotle, and in part from scraps of Aristotelian doctrine from the genuine works recast in problem form; secondly, a Hippocratic element; thirdly, a Theophrastean element; and lastly, a miscellaneous element which cannot be further defined than as being, in the main at least, Peripatetic in character. Three characteristically Peripatetic doctrines run through the whole compilation: the doctrine of *πέψις*, a 'concoction,' the process which solid and liquid nourishment undergoes in animals and plants; the doctrine of *πῦρ ἐπὶ πυρί*, that a greater heat overpowers a less; and the doctrine of the *ἀντιπερίστασις* of heat and cold.

As to the date at which the *Problems* reached their final form, it is difficult to dogmatize. The best criterion is that of language,⁴ and such forms as *πυκνάκις* (872^a, 22), *ρύδιστερον* (870^b, 37), and *εἰδήσται* (921^b, 26), to take only three examples, point to a date certainly not much earlier than the first century B.C., and probably a good deal later. Richter would put the date as late as the fifth or sixth century A.D.

E. S. FORSTER.

¹ *Die naturwissenschaftlichen Schriften des Aristoteles in ihrem Verhältnis zu den Büchern der hippokratischen Sammlung* (Bamberg, 1887).

² *De Aristotelis problematis*: Bonn, 1885.

³ See Prantl, *op. cit.*, pp. 358-9.

⁴ See Prantl, *op. cit.*, p. 355.

THE HISTORIA AUGUSTA: ITS DATE AND PURPOSE. A REPLY TO CRITICISM.

My suggestion¹ that the *H.A.* was written during the reign of the Emperor Julian and in his interest has had, on the whole, 'a bad press.'² Reviewers who have not thought it necessary to support with argument their doubts or their rejection of the theory are in a strong position: they remain practically unassailable. 'The theory seems on *a priori* grounds improbable':³ a historical student can only reply that so is human nature—distressingly improbable, as he knows to his cost. 'After reading this book one puts it down "met een zekere onvoldaanheid":'⁴ what can an author do save express his regret for having caused Dr. Van de Weerd this discomfort? But two stalwart defenders of the conservative position—De Sanctis⁵ and Lécrivain⁶—have sustained with detailed argument their unqualified rejection of my theory; in their cases it is possible to attempt a rejoinder.

One of the outstanding difficulties of which any theory of the composition of the *H.A.* must take account is the contradiction between the praise of a legitimate dynasty—the 'Claudius' motif—and the elaborate attack upon the *Erbkaisertum*—the 'unworthy sons' motif. This contradiction I endeavoured to explain by reference to Julian's Claudian descent on the one hand, and to the misrule of the sons of Constantine on the other. Commenting on this attempted explanation De Sanctis writes (p. 405): 'A me sembra che la contraddizione in questo modo non si risolva punto. È assurdo infatti esaltare una dinastia o anche parlare di dinastie predeterminate dagli dèi alla gloria se si ritiene che i valentuomini o morirono senza figli o ne ebbero di tali che sarebbe stato meglio non fossero nati.' There is, of course, a formal contradiction, but it arises from the facts of history as interpreted by the S.H.A. The house of the *Claudii* had a great destiny, even though Diocletian died childless, and though Constantine left behind him a legacy of unworthy sons. To those who read between the lines of the *Tendenzschrift* would this antithesis have necessarily appeared 'absurd'? De Sanctis proceeds: 'La contraddizione invece si spiega bene se realmente la *H.A.* è, come vuol essere, opera di diversi scrittori dell' età di Diocleziano e di Costantino; perchè è naturale che vi si rispecchino le due tendenze contraddittorie allora egualmente sentite ed egualmente difese circa la successione, quella che la voleva determinata dal merito e quella che la voleva determinata dalla nascita: la prima avvalorata da ciò che era lo spirito e la base dell' ordinamento Diocleziano; la seconda favorita dalle aspirazioni di Costanzo Cloro e degli amici di lui e del giovane Costantino.' This explanation is, however, hardly satisfactory. Diocletian, it is true, in the first instance chose his colleagues *propter virtutem*: this might explain the 'merito' motif; but why should writers of the time of Diocletian make so sustained an attack upon the *Erbkaisertum*? We no longer believe that the hereditary principle was excluded from Diocletian's ordering of the succession.⁷ The colleagues chosen originally on the ground of merit were destined

¹ Cf. *C.R.* XXXVIII. 165-9; *The Historia Augusta: Its Date and Purpose*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1926.

² But cf. *C.R.* XLI. 82-3; *Journal of Roman Studies*, XVI. 137-140.

³ *American Historical Review* XXXII. (1927), 638.

⁴ *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* VI. 373.

⁵ *Rivista di Filologia*, N.S. V. 402-406.

⁶ *Revue Historique* CLIV. 113-4.

⁷ Cf. especially G. Goyau, 'La Tetrarchie: Sommaire d'une étude d'ensemble,' in *Études d'Histoire juridique offertes à Paul Frédéric Girard par ses Élèves*, Vol. I., pp. 68-85. Paris, 1912.

to be the founders of Jovian and Herculian *dynasties*: 'Diis genitis et *deorum creatoribus*' in the words of the dedication on *C.I.L.* III. 710. The explanation put forward by De Sanctis still leaves the 'unworthy sons' *motif* an enigma. Indeed, it might be urged that De Sanctis has taken insufficient account of the writings of the Apostle: I would suggest that neither the 'Claudius' *motif* nor the 'unworthy sons' *motif* has been invented by the S.H.A.; each has been borrowed from Julian, and only the elaboration of those themes is the work of the S.H.A. The Claudius motif is clearly stated by Julian: *τούτοις ἐπεισέρχεται Κλαύδιος εἰς ὃν ἀπιόντες οἱ θεοὶ πάντες ἡγάσθησαν τε αὐτὸν τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας καὶ ἐπένενταν αὐτὸν τῷ γένει τὴν ἀρχήν, δίκαιον εἶναι νομίσαντες οὐτω φιλοπάτριος ἀνδρὸς ἐπὶ πλευτον εἶναι τὸ γένος ἐν ἡγεμονίᾳ* (313D). The 'unworthy sons' motif arose in Julian's mind from a contemplation of the reign of his hero, Marcus Aurelius: two blots upon the fair fame of the philosopher Emperor pained his disciple. Those blots are stated in the arraignment of Silenus: *τὰ περὶ τὸν οὐν καὶ τὴν γυναικα πολυπραγμοῦν* [sc. ὁ Σειληνὸς] ἀμαρτήματα, τὴν μὲν ὅτι πλέον ἡ προσήκει ἐπένθησεν, ἀλλως τε οὐδὲ κοσμίαν οὐσαν, τῷ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἀρχὴν συναπολλυμένην περιεῖν, ἔχων καὶ ταῦτα σπουδαῖον κηδεστή, ὃς τῶν τε κοινῶν ἀν προύστη κρείτον καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ βέλτιον ἀν ἐπεμελήθη ἡ αὐτὸν αἴνον, καίπερ οὖν ταῦτα πολυπραγμοῦν ὡδεῖτο τὸ μέγεθος αὐτοῦ τῆς ἀρετῆς τόν γε μὴν νίκα οὐδὲ τὸν σκωφθῆναι νομίσας ἄξιον ἐφῆκεν (312A-c). The charge is repeated later when Silenus τὸ τέλος ἀπορύμενος . . . ἐπιφύεται τοῖς περὶ τὸν παῖδα καὶ τὴν γαμετὴν αὐτῷ δοκοῦσιν οὐκ ὄρθως οὐδὲ κατὰ λόγον πεποιῆσθαι, τὴν μὲν ὅτι ταῖς ἡρωίναις ἐνέγραψε, τῷ δὲ ὅτι τὴν ἡγεμονίαν ἐπέτρεψεν (334B). Marcus pleads in defence that he was but imitating the gods (334B-D), and that in raising his son to the purple he was instituting no new custom: *πατοί τε γὰρ νόμουν ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς διαδοχάς, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπαντει εὐχούται* (334D-335A). The weakness of the plea is manifest, and Julian's own view is doubtless rightly represented by Libanius: ἀλλὰ μὴν ὡς γνήσιος ἦν κηδεμῶν τῆς ἀρχῆς καὶ οὐ τάκεινης ἡγε πρὸ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ, πολλαχόθεν μὲν δεδήλωται, σαφέστερον δὲ ἀν ὡδί γένοιτο. παρακαλούμενος γὰρ ἐπὶ γάμον παρὰ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, ὅπως παῖδας φυτεύσει κληρονόμους τῆς ἀρχῆς, τοῦτ' αὐτὸ δεδίως ἔφη μέλλειν, μὴ κακὸ φύτεις νόμῳ παραλαβόντες διαφθείρωσι τὰ πράγματα τὸ τοῦ Φαέθοντος παθόντες. οὕτω τὴν ἀπαδίλαν τὴν αὐτοῦ τῆς εἰς τὰς πόλεις λύμης κονθότερον ἔκρινεν (*Or. XVIII.*, § 181). Here we have clearly expressed the 'unworthy sons' motif of the S.H.A. The comment of C. W. King on this passage is: 'He had a warning in his own family, the conduct of the three sons of Constantine' (*Julian the Emperor*, London, 1888, p. 178). Precisely so. Nor is this all: in one passage of Julian the two motifs of the S.H.A. are brought into close connexion: *οἱ παλαμανοὶ δάμοις punished the sons of Constantine for their impiety αἰμάτων συγγενῶν τιννίμενοι δίκας, ἔως ὁ Ζεὺς διὰ τὸν Κλαύδιον καὶ Κωνστάντιον (i.e. Constantius Chlorus) ἔδωκεν ἀναπνέσαι* (336B). I would not assert that the S.H.A. had read the *Caesares* of Julian, but I am convinced that they drew from the Emperor's known views the inspiration for their *Tendenzschrift*.

I had suggested that the religious attitude of the S.H.A. mirrors the conciliatory policy of Julian in the early months of his reign. De Sanctis objects that 'la posizione di Giuliano verso il cristianesimo fu sempre d'avversione e anzi di battaglia.' This is in my judgment to do less than justice to the evidence as summarized by J. Bidez in his paper, 'L'Évolution de la Politique de l'Empereur Julien en Matière religieuse,' *Bulletin de l'Académie royale de Belgique*, Classe des Lettres, etc., No. 7 (1914), pp. 406-61. Bruxelles, 1914. But the further point raised by De Sanctis is of greater weight. If the project of a Persian war was known to the S.H.A. when they compiled their work, then by that time the Emperor had declared himself the open foe of the Christian religion, and that change of policy must have been mirrored in the *H.A.* But this argument suggests a further and perhaps an unanswerable question—what was the attitude of the population of the western capital towards Christianity? In the aristocracy of Rome paganism found its last stronghold in the

West; but if the *H.A.* is a 'Volksbuch,' directed to a popular audience, it must necessarily have taken account of the beliefs of the Roman populace. If that audience were largely Christian, the writers of the *H.A.* may have had good reason for the striking reserve and the curious caution of their pagan apologetic. It must be remembered that after the abdication of Diocletian Maxentius ὁ τὴν ἐπὶ 'Ρώμης τυραννίδα συστησάμενος ἀρχόμενος μὲν τὴν καθ' ἡμᾶς πίστιν ἐπ' ἀρεσκεῖσθαι καὶ κολακεῖσθαι τοῦ δῆμου 'Ρωμαίων καθηπερίνατο ταῦτη τε τοῖς ἵπηκοις τὸν κατὰ Χριστιανῶν ἀνῖναι προστάττει διωγμόν, εὐερεβίαν ἐπιμορφάζονταί ἦσαν δέξιοι καὶ πολὺ πρᾶοι παρὰ τοὺς προτέρους φανεῖν (Eusebius, *H.E.* XIV. 1), that in pursuance of the same policy he restored to Pope Miltiades the confiscated properties belonging to the Church (Augustine, *Brev. Coll.* III. 34), while he issued an edict of toleration for Africa (Optatus, *De Schism. Don.* I. 18). It was in Rome that Constantine, after the battle of the Milvian Bridge, declared his allegiance to the God of the Christians; and it might be urged that modern historians, in writing of the reign of Valentinian I., have not always apprehended the significance of the hotly contested battles fought out in the streets of the western capital between the foes and the partisans of Pope Damasus. Is it fantastic to suggest that the strength of Christian feeling in the δῆμος 'Ρωμαίων determined the tone of the *S.H.A.*? If the *Vita Aureliani* had really been composed in the first decade of the fourth century and before the conversion of Constantine—*De Sanctis* dates it between May 1, 305, and July 25, 306—the studied moderation of its plea for paganism would appear to me, I confess, inexplicable.¹

De Sanctis then considers the passage from *Vita Cari* 9, which on my theory was inspired by Julian's projected campaign against Persia: it contains the words, 'licet plane et licet ut per sacratissimum Caesarem Maximianum constitutus Persas vincere . . . et futurum reor si a nostris non deseratur promissus numinum favor.' On this he makes 'una osservazione che mi sembra capitale per fissare la data: così ovvia del resto che stupirebbe non fosse stata già fatta da altri': no one would have given to Maximian the title of Caesar after May 1, 305, when he was created Augustus. This proves that the *Vita Cari*, or at least this particular section of the *Vita*, was written between A.D. 297 and May 1, 305. We should be grateful to De Sanctis for calling our attention yet again to this passage: really Vopiscus was a very ingenious fellow! I had never previously noticed the effect upon the reader of the insertion of the word 'sacratissimum.' 'Ut per Caesarem Maximianum constitutus'—'as was proved by Maximianus when Caesar'—in that form the statement would not have admitted of any inference regarding the date of the composition of the passage: 'Caesarem' would have been neutral; but 'per *sacratissimum Caesarem*'—the use of the honorific epithet *suggests* the writing of a contemporary. It is, indeed, a much subtler touch than the method of bald assertion employed in the *Vita Aureliani* 44, 5, 'et est quidem iam Constantius imperator.' Vopiscus must surely have chuckled as he penned the word.

De Sanctis closes his review with the remark that 'it is singular that the author should have allowed to escape him a work which, not without value in itself, would have been for him of particular importance in view of the affinity of the thesis there

¹ The 'discretezza' and 'cautela' with which Vopiscus has proceeded in his defence of paganism are emphasized by Giovanni Costa in his valuable and suggestive study of the *Vita Aureliani: Un Libello anticristiano del secolo IV.?* *Il Divus Aurelianus di Vopisco*. Bilychnis XXII. (1923), 127-133. Costa would place the composition of *Vita Aureliani*, cc. I. to XXXVII. 4, between the years A.D. 343 and 360; the rest of the *Vita*, which he would regard as an appendix

by another hand, he is inclined to date in the reign of Gratian, at the time of the controversy between Symmachus and Ambrose over the altar of Victory. See further his paper on 'L'opposizione sotto i Costantini' in *Raccolta di Scritti in onore di Giacomo Lumbroso* (=Pubblicazioni di 'Aegyptus,' Série Scientifica, Vol. III.), Milan, 1925, pp. 293-8. I had not seen either of these papers when I wrote my book.

sustained
quals tem
on page
Hohl; i
unsuccess
read the
about the
(23, 5) i
tus); t
Placidus
Vitae of
His gen
to produ
44, 5 the
tius Chl
purpose
Thus he
the Pro
e apollin
adminis
natural
restorat

I e
fensible
of signi
may re
question
Aurelia
word fo
explain
tion th
d'unio
Costanz

Ha
to cons
I.
sans da
already
to proc
inheren
amazin

2.
a gener
characte
associa
of the

¹ If C
(pp. 31-3
a chron
written
memory
Vita Pr

it must
If that
I reason
It must
i 'Póμης
ία καὶ
τὸν κατὰ
καὶ πολὺ^{re}
e of the
g to the
ation for
after the
Christians;
rian I.,
s fought
of Pope
in the
d really
sion of
studied
le.¹

theory
words,
Persas
favor.'
a: così
d have
created
of the
eful to
s was a
ader of
n con-
tement
position
ssimum
porary.
yed in
s must
author
would
s there
in the
roversy
the altar
L'oppo-
critti in
ioni di
Milan,
f these

sustained with his own theory.' The reference is to the monograph of M. Giri: *In quale tempo abbia scritto Vopisco le biografie degli imperatori*, Torino, 1905. As I stated on page 108 of my book, Giri's monograph was only known to me from a review by Hohl; it is in none of our public libraries, and my efforts to obtain a copy had been unsuccessful. Through the kindness of Professor Hohl I have now been enabled to read the book. Giri would place the composition of the *H.A.* under Constantius II. about the middle of the fourth century; the *Vita Probi* by its reference to civil war (23, 5) is to be dated to 350-1 (outbreak of war between Constantius and Magnentius); the *Vita Aureliani*, because of the mention of the consulship of Furius Placidus as a recent event, should probably be assigned to A.D. 345 or 346. The other *Vitae* of Vopiscus were in Giri's opinion composed between the years 345 and 351. His general contention is that Vopiscus, writing under Constantius II., had no desire to produce the impression that he was writing at any earlier date: in *Vita Aureliani* 44, 5 the words 'et est quidem iam Constantius imperator' refer, indeed, to Constantius Chlorus, but *est* is here a historic present. Vopiscus had no political or dynastic purpose, he is no 'forger,' but a simple rhetorician living in the world of his books. Thus he reports in all good faith the Probus oracle, and apparently knew nothing of the Probi who had already been consuls (!); immersed 'nelle idee dei neopitagorici e apolliniani,' wishful for peace and silence, he was a stranger to the political and administrative world of his day. He was a pagan, and viewed the senate as the natural representative and champion of the older faith; he therefore claimed a restoration of its ancient rights.

I entirely agree with De Sanctis that the main thesis of the book is indefensible, and therefore, for my own purpose, there is little in the monograph which is of significance. But it may be noted that Giri recognizes that *Vita Aureliani* 43, 3, 4 may refer to the *camarilla* formed at the court of Constantius, while to the question 'Why is there no mention of Constantine in such a passage as Aurelian 44, 5?' he replies that Vopiscus, as a pagan, could not have said a good word for the first Christian emperor. It may further be remarked that Giri would explain the fact that Vopiscus says so little of Constantius Chlorus by the consideration that Constantius 'apparisce infatti qui (=Aurelian 44, 5) come "un trait d'union" fra Claudio II. e Costanzo II.' (p. 62); to this I would agree, if for Costanzo II. we read 'Giuliano l'Apostata.'

Having thus sought to meet the arguments adduced by De Sanctis we may turn to consider the objections raised by Lécrivain.

1. 'Pourquoi ce subterfuge de compilateurs au lieu d'un panégyrique franc et sans danger?' A pertinent question to which I can give no adequate answer. I have already suggested that in Rome it may have been politic for the pagan propagandist to proceed with caution. The difficulty is not, of course, peculiar to my theory: it is inherent in the documents themselves. Why is the apology for paganism so amazingly discreet? What would be M. Lécrivain's explanation?

2. 'Beaucoup de mesures ont pu être répétées sous différents empereurs.' As a general statement this is indisputable; I would, however, desire to accentuate the *character* of the parallels—'specific acts which, so far as I am aware, do not recur associated with a single emperor in the history of any other reign—e.g. the clearance of the palace, the corn-supply of Rome, favours to Jews, treatment of eunuchs,

¹ If Giri is right, however, in his contention (pp. 31-3) that Vopiscus has carefully constructed a chronological scheme for his authorities—written sources for the period to which oral memory would not reach (*Vita Aureliani* 15, 2; *Vita Probi* 3, 4); the authority of his grandfather for the period from the death of Probus until

after Diocletian's accession (*Vita Saturnini* 9, 4; *Vita Bonosi* 15, 4; *Vita Numeriani* 13, 3; 14, 15; 15, 5); and that of his father for the period after Diocletian's abdication (*Vita Aureliani* 43, 2)—then my interpretation of the last-mentioned passage (pp. 97-8 of my book) will not stand.

governors taken up into the imperial vehicle, etc.,' as I wrote in my book (p. 149). The character of this parallelism still appears to me strictly unexampled, and, until some real analogy be adduced, I shall continue to regard it as presenting a problem which needs an explanation. That explanation I have sought to supply.

3. 'La glorification du sénat était devenue, surtout depuis Aurélius Victor, un thème banal.' I should prefer to say timely, of living interest, because under Julian the theme had become 'practical politics.' But 'surtout depuis Aurélius Victor'—the phrase is interesting when written by M. Lécrivain: does this mean that he has adopted the Theodosian dating of the S.H.A.?—otherwise, if the composition of the *H.A.* is assigned to the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, the words are curiously irrelevant.

4. 'M. Baynes paraît placer la compilation dans la première partie du règne de Julien; mais ce n'est qu'après la fin de son règne qu'ils auraient pu utiliser toute sa législation. Quel eût été alors l'intérêt de ce panégyrique posthume?' None, I agree; but the public acts of Julian to which the author of the *Vita of Alexander Severus* may be deemed to refer are (i.) the criminal commission at Chalcedon; (ii.) the purgation of the imperial court; (iii.) the corn-supply of Rome; (iv.) the favour shown to the senate; (v.) measures in favour of the fiscus and the municipia; (vi.) favour shown to the Jews.¹ Nos. i.-iv. all fall in the first months of the reign; (v.) the reference is to the constitution of March 362 (restored by Bidez and Cumont, pp. 52 sqq. of their edition of Julian's correspondence); (vi.) no certain date can be given, for the question depends on the authenticity of Julian's 25th letter (Hertlein) which is disputed. If the facts there stated can be relied upon, Julian refused at his accession to enforce a special tax which Constantius was about to impose upon the Jews. I cannot see that there is any difficulty in the supposition that news of these measures had reached Rome a considerable time before the Emperor's death.

5. 'M. Baynes n'a surtout pas le droit d'utiliser pour sa théorie des textes postérieurs, notamment Socrate et Ammien Marcellin.' So far as I remember, I referred three times to the Church History of Socrates: on p. 66 of my book to illustrate Julian's admiration for Alexander the Great; the fact of that admiration can be demonstrated from Julian's letter to Themistius; on pp. 124 and 139 I referred to *H.E.* III. 1 for the eunuch régime of Constantius and Julian's purgation of the court: the evidence of Libanius suffices. Let us not insist on Socrates. But when M. Lécrivain complains of my use of the history of Ammianus Marcellinus, I fail to understand the ground of his objection: the history is, of course, 'un texte postérieur,' but its author was strictly a contemporary of the emperor Julian under whom he served; as the work of a contemporary the history, I would contend, can fairly be used as evidence in the consideration of our present problem.

6. 'L'attribution à Julien du rescrit d'Alexandre sur le christianisme, dans les termes où nous l'avons, est insoutenable.' I agree; I never supposed that the words 'Christianos esse passus est' are other than a plain statement of fact, and Julian's toleration of the Christians is unquestioned.

In a word, the arguments of M. Lécrivain directed against my theory have left me impenitent.

I wish to add a postscript:² when writing my book I was unable to adduce any parallel passage for two statements of the *Vita of Alexander Severus*. In C. 18, 3, we read 'adorari se vetuit': with this cf. Libanius, *Or. XVIII.* § 190 of Julian, *οὐ γὰρ τοὺς φόβους καὶ τὰς στύγας καὶ τὸ εἴσω τὴν χεῖρα ἔχειν καὶ τὸ κύπτειν εἰς γῆν*

¹ If the conjecture 'ius confarreatiois' is adopted in 26, 3, the marriage law cannot be dated, for no such constitution has been pre-

served.

² There is one misprint in my book, for which I apologize: for *Gothic war* on p. 119 read *Gallic*.

καὶ τὸ βάντ' ἐλευθέριον
are told 'διαβάντες τὸν
343C. ἡ διαβάντες τὸν
Antioch—
ἐπεισας τὸν
δύναμα, δούλοι
good autho

καὶ τὸ βλέπειν εἰς τὸ ὑπόδημα μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ πρόσωπον καὶ τὸ δούλους ἀντ' ἐλευθέρων ὄρασθαι . . . οὐ ταῦτα ἡγέτο τὴν βασιλέιαν αὔξειν. . . . In C. 4, 1, we are told 'dominum se appellari vetuit': with this cf. Julian's words in the Misopogon 343c. ἡ δὲ εἰρωνεία πόση;—the paragraph is put into the mouth of the inhabitants of Antioch—δεσπότης εἶναι οὐ φίς οὐδὲ ἀνέχη τοῦτο ἀκούων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀγανάκτεις ὥστε ἥδη ἐπεισας τὸν πλέωντος ἐθάδας πάλαι γενομένους ἀφελεῖν ὡς ἐπίφθονον τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦτο τὸ ὄνομα, δουλεύειν δ' ἡμᾶς ἀναγκάζεις ἀρχοντι καὶ νόμοις κ.τ.λ. Lampridius had, I believe, good authority for his statements.

NORMAN H. BAYNES.

TACITUS, *HISTORIES* I. 13.

Nec minor gratia Icelo, Galbae liberto, quem anulis donatum equestri nomine Marcianum uocitabant.

In a note on this passage as far back as 1868, E. Wölfflin¹ advanced the theory that the plural *anulis* is used here in a technical and stereotyped way as symbolic of equestrian rank. He is not sure whether such illogical use of the plural is to be found earlier than Tacitus or not.

No reasons are advanced for this assumed arbitrary use of *anuli*, and no attempt seems to have been made to examine all available data; yet Wölfflin's rather casual suggestion has been accepted without question by a long succession of editors.

It is here proposed to consider another possible explanation of the use of the plural *anuli* in reference to the knighthood of a single individual. Attention is invited first to the following passage:

Suetonius, *Iul.* 39. 2: Ludis Decimus Laberius eques Romanus mimum suum egit, donatusque quingentis sestertiis et *anulo aureo* sessum in quattuordecim e scaena per orchestram transiit.

In this gratuitous insult to the equestrian order, Caesar goes through the form of elevating Laberius to knighthood, giving him four hundred thousand sesterces and the golden ring, the latter manifestly as symbolic of rank.²

For the matter now under discussion, the interesting thing is that Laberius was already a knight at the time of the incident above described. Indeed he himself stresses this point in the plaint which has been preserved by Macrobius (II. 7. 3):

Ego bis tricens annis actis sine nota
Eques Romanus e Lare egressus meo
Domum reuertar mimus; ni mirum hoc die
Uno plus uixi mihi quam uiuendum fuit.

As a member of a distinguished equestrian family, Laberius doubtless had long worn the badge of the order. If so, Caesar's gift assured in his case a plurality of rings.

This raises an interesting question. Suetonius above has used the singular (*anulo aureo*) in a technical reference to the badge of knighthood for an individual; if in the following he does not mean plurality of rings, why does he shift to *aureis anulis*?

Vit. 12: (Asiaticum) manumisit ac primo imperii die *aureis anulis* super cenam.

This question gains added point when another case is considered wherein an

¹ *Philologus* XXVII., p. 128.

² Cf. the mention of a similar incident by Pollio, *apud Cic. ad Fam.* X. 32. 2: '(Balbus)

Herennium Gallum histriōnē summo ludorum die *anulo aureo* donatum in xiiii sessum deduxit.'

event is de
the plural

T
adfixu

The e
knighted
stand Tac
emperor, a
ings of the
one of Vit
Speal
fashionabl

So of

Here
Much mo
The lemn

These
friend's fo
hood. It
plural for
which is t

In v
possesse
noted ab
other rea

cogn

¹ That
hyperbole
Pliny, *N.
medium* nu
rantur, atq
aliis (*anul*
the captur
nibal; Va
relates th
over his r
Cf., too, *S
Apol.* 75;

event is described that was subsequent to the conferment of the emperor's gift, and the plural *anulis* thus is disassociated from any conventional verb like *donare*:

Tacitus, *Hist.* IV. 3. 3: Solacio fuit seruus Vergilii Capitonis . . . patibulo adfixus in *isdem anulis* quos acceptos a Vitellio gestabat.

The editors agree that this means that the person referred to had previously been knighted by Vitellius. Anyone without a theory to defend would certainly understand Tacitus to say that the man was decked out with golden *rings* presented by the emperor, and that this advertisement of his status helped to soothe the irritated feelings of the populace, whose attention was thus drawn to the fact that the victim was one of Vitellius' 'knights.'

Speaking of rings in general, there is plenty of evidence that plurality was fashionable, e.g., Martial XI. 59. 1 sqq.:

Senos Charinus omnibus digitis gerit
Nec nocte ponit anulos
Nec cum lauatur.¹

So of an upstart knight (Juvenal I. 26 sqq.):

cum uerna Canopi
Crispinus Tyrias umero reuocante lacernas
Ventilet *aestium* digitis sudantibus *aurum*,
Nec sufferre queat maioris pondera gemmae.

Here is an exquisite who had gold rings of different weights for different seasons! Much more important is an epigram of Martial in the book of *Apophoreta* (XIV.). The lemma of 122 is *Anuli*, and the epigram reads:

Ante frequens sed nunc rarus *nos* donat amicus.
Felix cui comes est non alienus eques.

These lines are for the use of a man who is old-fashioned enough to increase a friend's fortune to 400,000 sesterces in order that he may be elevated to the knighthood. It will be noticed that *nos* picks up *anuli*, indicating that the latter has natural plural force.² *Rings* (a pair?) are sent as an earnest of the substantial gift of money which is to round out the fortune of the recipient.

In view of these facts, it seems not at all unlikely that individual knights often possessed more than one ring, either as a recognition of special service (see cases noted above), or as appropriate to membership in the emperor's household, or for other reasons.³ Cf. further reference to the cases of Icelus and Asiaticus:

Suetonius, *Gal.* 14. 2: Libertus Icelus paulo ante *anulis aureis* et Marciani cognomine ornatus.

¹ That this is something more than sheer hyperbole is shown by the sober testimony of Pliny, *N.H.* XXXIII., § 25: 'Hic (digitus medius) nunc solus excipitur, ceteri omnes onerantur, atque etiam priuatum articuli minoribus aliis (*anulis*).' So Livy (XXVII 28. 4) tells of the capture of the *rings* of Marcellus by Hannibal; Valerius Maximus (VII. 8. 5, 8 and 9) relates three instances of a dying man delivering over his rings (*anulos*) to the presumptive heir. Cf., too, Seneca, *de Ben.* III. 25. 1: Apuleius, *Apol.* 75; and Festus, 182, s.v. *Orata*.

² It should be added that the lemmata of this book are regularly in the singular, except in reference to pairs or groups of things; e.g. XIV. 63. 1:

Tibiae

Ebria *nos* madidis rumpit tibicina buccis.

³ It is interesting that, in giving directions for the decoration of his monument, Trimalchio (Petronius 71) proceeds as follows: 'Te rogo ut . . . facias . . . me in tribunali sedentem praetextatum *cum anulis aureis* quinque.'

Tacitus, *Hist.* II. 57. 3 sqq.: Postulante exercitu ut libertum suum Asiaticum *equestri dignitate* donaret, in honestam adulationem compescit; dein mobilitate ingenii, quod palam abnuerat, inter secreta conuiuii largitur, *onerauitque* Asiaticum *anulis*, foedum mancipium et malis artibus ambitiosum.

The editors have somewhat spoiled this second passage by emending *onerauit* of the best manuscript to *honorauit*. Apparently the lavish bestowal of rings made the disgraceful performance even more disgusting.¹

Another bit of evidence of some importance is found in the following passage:

Pliny, *N.H.* XXXIII., § 152: Vidimus et ipsi Arelium Fuscum *motum equestri ordine* ob insignem columniam . . . *argenteos anulos* habentem.

The fact that the plural is still used after the disgraced knight changed to the wearing of silver shows rather conclusively that he had previously possessed more than one of the gold rings.²

Consequently there should be no difficulty in giving the natural plural interpretation to the ablative of the passage which is the subject of this note. On that basis, *anulis donatum equestri nomine Marcianum* would mean: 'who had been presented with (golden) rings (by the emperor), and was known by the equestrian name "Marcianus".'

In fact, at least up to the time when Suetonius wrote, nothing is found to indicate that *anuli*, by a technical turn, was used for the singular to denote the equestrian standing of an individual; and there is no obvious reason why the plural should be so used.

It is not impossible, of course, that the practice of giving a plurality of rings to an individual favoured a later misunderstanding of the significance of the plural number, with a very remote parallel in the improper use of the plural *epistulae* for a single missive. And it is true that the phrase *ius anulorum* has a formal and technical sound; but there is no case at hand that would prove that the words were ever used, at least in classical times, for a grant limited to the use of one ring. On the contrary, the familiar companion phrase *usus anulorum*, which is by nature rather more concrete, must have exerted an influence toward keeping alive the literal force of *anulorum* as used in references to individual knights.

A rather early reference to the use of *ius anulorum* is interesting in this connexion:

Suetonius, *Iul.* 33: Existimatur (Caesar) etiam equestres census pollicitus *singulis*; quod accidit opinione falsa. Nam cum in adloquendo adhortandoque saepius digitum laeuae manus ostentans adfirmaret se ad satis faciendum omnibus . . . anulum quoque aequo animo detracturum sibi, extrema contio, cui facilis erat uidere contionantem quam audire, pro dicto accepit, quod uisu suspicabatur; promissumque *ius anulorum cum milibus quadringenis* fama distulit.

Many on that occasion expected to be made knights (note *singulis*); and *ius anulorum* is itself involved in a phrase containing a distributive numeral (*quadringenis*). Probably we should not go far astray in translating simply: 'the right to wear gold rings, together with 400,000 sesterces for each man.'³

¹ It may be worth noting that Pliny (*N.H.* XXXIII., § 25) uses the verb *onerare* of the profuse use of rings.

² Cf. Pliny's account (*Ep.* VIII. 6. 4) of the senate's decree that conferred the *ornamenta praetoria* upon the freedman Pallas: 'Mitto quod (senatores) censem (Palladem) non exhortandum

modo, uerum etiam compellendum ad usum *aureorum anulorum* (erat enim contra maiestatem senatus, si ferreis praetorius uteretur). Clearly Pallas is urged to forego the use of iron rings in favour of gold rings.

³ Cf. the note *ad loc.* in the Westcott-Rankin edition.

If one were looking for the development of a technical phrase, it would not be unnatural to seek a route through the use of the singular (*aureus anulus*) as employed to indicate the rank of a group of individuals. Compare the collective application of the singular in the following:

Suetonius, *Nero* 20. 3: *Adulescentulos equestris ordinis . . . undique elegit, qui . . . operam . . . nauarent cantanti sibi, . . . puris ac sine anulo laeuis, quorum duces quadringena milia sestertia merebant.*¹

Note also *semenstri auro*,² and *auro equestri*,³ and compare *ferreo anulo*.⁴

H. C. NUTTING.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

¹ The textual difficulties of this passage do not concern the point here under discussion.

³ Horace, *Serm. II. 7. 53.*

² Juvenal VII. 89.

⁴ Pliny, *N.H. XXXIII.*, §§ 21 and 33.

ZU *P. OXY.* III. 414.

DIESES von mir im J. 1924 behandelte¹ Papyrusbruchstück wurde 1927 von v. Wilamowitz² berücksichtigt. Er hält meine Zurückführung des Bruchstückes auf Antiphon für sehr ansprechend und auch meine Erklärung für treffend; die Ergänzungen befriedigen ihn nur zum Teil. Letzteres muss ich ihm unbedingt zugeben. Leider sind alle kleinen Fragmente des Papyrus sowie die Zz. 1-6 des Fr. B bei dem Hinüberführen aus England nach Amerika (oder bald darauf) spurlos verschwunden und somit für die Wissenschaft auf immer verloren;³ es ist also nicht mehr möglich zu beurteilen, ob ich Recht hatte, als ich die Zz. 14-15 des Fr. A mit dem Fr. F vereinigte. Dagegen ist Col. II. des Fr. A glücklicherweise erhalten; Prof. W. L. Westermann legte eine ganz hervorragende Freundlichkeit an den Tag, indem er mir zuerst eine photographische Aufnahme davon zusandte und dann meine Lesung an der Hand des Originals prüfte. Bei dem näheren Studium der Photographie bemerkte ich, dass sowohl Hunts Lesung der Z. 7 ($\pi\epsilon[\cdot] \dot{\epsilon}\pi[\cdot] \phi$) wie auch meine frühere durch diese falsche Lesung ins Leben gerufene Ergänzung ganz unmöglich sind. Auf der Photographie las ich Z. 7 $\pi\epsilon[\cdot] \epsilon\pi[\cdot] \eta\delta$ - - , und teilte dieses Ergebnis W. L. Westermann mit. Nachdem er in das Original noch einmal eingesehen hatte, antwortete er mir darauf; 'Das ist die richtige Lesung. Es ist absolut sicher.' Zu der scheinbar nächstliegenden Ergänzung $\pi\epsilon[\cdot] \dot{\epsilon}\pi[\cdot] \eta\delta[\epsilon] \mu\alpha\tau\omega$, die auch ich im ersten Augenblick für passend hielt, kam Westermann, nachdem ihm mein Vorschlag zur richtigen Lesung des Textes bekannt worden war, ganz unabhängig von mir; ich glaube trotzdem dass diese Lesung nicht das Richtige trifft. Wir haben doch in Col. II. eine Reihe von Antithesen (s. unten); aus $\pi\epsilon[\cdot] \gamma\omega$ - - | $\nu\eta\gamma$ (Z. 5) ist aber keine Antithese zu $\dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omega$ zu konstruieren. Was nun diese Stelle (Z. 5) anbetrifft, so ist hier nur die Lesung $\gamma\omega$ (vielleicht auch $\gamma\rho$?) möglich, keinesfalls aber das von mir a. a. O. vermutete $\gamma\alpha$. Aus den Resten $\gamma\omega$ | $\nu\eta\gamma$ ist allerdings kein griechisches Wort zu ergänzen; doch haben die einzelnen Zeilen des Papyrus nicht gleiche Längen,⁴ sodass nichts dem im Wege steht, dass Z. 5 nach $\gamma\omega$ auch nichts gestanden habe; dann gelangen wir zur Lesung: $\pi\epsilon[\cdot] \gamma\omega | \nu\eta\gamma \dot{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega[\pi\omega\gamma] \pi\epsilon[\cdot] \dot{\epsilon}\pi[\cdot] \eta\delta[\epsilon] \mu\alpha\tau\omega$, d. h. 'von der Geburt der Menschen sowie von den Bestattungsbräuchen'⁵—auch hier haben wir dann, wie in allen anderen Antithesen von Col. II. (s. den Text unten) an der ersten Stelle $\tau\alpha \dot{\epsilon}\nu\mu\phi\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\alpha$, an der zweiten $\tau\alpha \mu\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon}\nu\mu\phi\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\alpha$ $\tau\alpha \mu\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon}\nu\mu\phi\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\alpha$, vgl. Antiphon, *P. Oxy.* 1364, Col. III., Z. 28: $\kappa\alpha \tau\alpha \mu\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\epsilon}\nu\mu\phi\epsilon\tau\omega\tau\alpha \dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\omega$.

Ich habe bereits a. a. O. darauf hingewiesen, dass wir demselben Gedankengang und derselben Disposition, welche wir hier Col. II. treffen, auch bei Platon, *Ion* 531c, begegnen. Diese Behauptung fußte allerdings auf einer falschen Ergänzung der Stelle, doch bleibt sie auch bei der richtigen bestehen, vgl.

¹ *Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences de Russie*, 1924, S. 373 sqq.

² *Hermes* LXII., 1927, S. 288, A. 1.

³ Prof. A. S. Hunt in Oxford schreibt mir darüber: 'I have no doubt that the fragment F was included with the others, and if it is not now there (in New York), I can only suppose that it was either lost in transit or mislaid somehow on arrival. So far as I know, no statement has been previously made by the Columbia Library, that this fragment was missing.' Andrereits teilt mir aber Prof. W. L. Westermann von Columbia University (New York) mit: 'We

have four pieces only, we have never had any more than this . . . Nichts hätte törichter sein können, als dieses Stück (*P. Oxy.* III. 414) zu verteilen in allen Ländern der Erde. Also gelang es mir nicht, den wahren Sachverhalt genau zu ermitteln.'

⁴ 'Sie werden beobachtet haben, dass die Zeilenlängen sehr verschieden sind' (Westermann, brieflich).

⁵ Vgl. Z. B. Patroklos' Bestattung in der *Ilias*. 'Επικήδευμα verhält sich ganz so zu έπικήδειος, wie έπιτήδευμα zu έπιτήδειος.'

ἢ Ὁμηρος
σύμπαντες

... περ
ἀγαθῶν
... καὶ
μάτων καὶ
καὶ γε

Was
Gesagten
τίνας ἀληθεία
καὶ μονομάχη
λογία
τροπής
τροπής
ja die Mu
verachtet
insoweit e
Ferd. Dür
und ande
auf Antip
denn auch
verworfen
zu erblick

Der Ü
des Papy

[ός π
ηκιστα <·
ἢν ἔχω γν
ποιήσαιν
είναι . . .

Das Un
Z. 12 δικλεί

—
τῶν θείων
εἰκόνες γὰρ
ποιητῶν
Z. 1-4 ε

¹ *Hermes* 62, 1927, 288.

² Siehe meine Arbeit 'Die antiken Trauerreden', *Sciences de l'Antiquité* 1927.

³ Im Auftrag der Universität, welcher im April 1927 bald erscheinen wird.

⁴ Vgl. noch *Iliad*, 1. c., S. 1072, wo Homers Gedichte, V. 1923, z. B.

PLATON.

ἢ Ὁμηρος περὶ ἄλλων τινῶν λέγει ἢ ὅνπερ σύμπαντες οἱ ἄλλοι ποιηταί;

... περὶ ὄμιλιῶν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀνθρώπων ἀγαθῶν τε καὶ κακῶν. . .

... καὶ περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων παθημάτων καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀιδον καὶ γενέσεις ἡρώων.

(Auch die Reihenfolge der Beispiele ist an den beiden Stellen dieselbe.)

UNSERE STELLE.

(λέγουσιν οὖν οἱ ποιηταί ο. ἄ.)

[περὶ] καλῶν καὶ αἰσχρῶν, περὶ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων,

περὶ τῶν θείων περὶ τῶν ἐν Ἀιδον,

περὶ γονῆς ἀνθρώπων].

Was die Frage der Autorschaft anbetrifft, so kann ich ausser dem a. a. O. Gesagten noch auf folgendes hinweisen. Platon, *Leges* X., p. 889D, lesen wir: παιδίας τινας ἀληθείας οὐ σφόδρα μετεχόντας, ἀλλὰ εἴδωλ' ἄττα ἔνγγενη ἔντρων, οἱ δὲ γραφικὴ γενναὶ καὶ μονσική. . . M. Pohlenz¹ hat richtig gesehen, dass hier 'Plato die Darstellung einer ganz bestimmten Einzelpersönlichkeit vor Augen steht.' Das kann aber, trotz seiner Meinung, unmöglich Demokrit selbst gewesen sein, denn dieser schätzte ja die Musik sehr hoch (Fr. 179, 16-25), während die Quelle Platons sie verwirft und verachtet; die Ausführungen Pohlenz' sind aber gewiss in dem Grade richtig, insoweit er für diese Quelle einen Demokriteer hält. Nun hoffe ich einerseits nach Ferd. Dümmler bewiesen zu haben, dass die Quelle dieser Platonstelle Antiphon ist² und anderseits, dass Antiphon ein Demokriteer war.³ Geht aber diese Platonstelle auf Antiphon zurück, so fällt die Ähnlichkeit mit unserem Papyrusbruchstück auf, denn auch hier wird der wichtigste Zweig der Musik—die Poesie—getadelt und verworfen. Noch ein Grund dafür, um im Verfasser des Bruchstückes den Antiphon zu erblicken.⁴

Der Übersichtlichkeit halber gebe ich zum Schluss meine verbesserte Ergänzung des Papyrus.

COL. I.

[ώς πρὸς μάνην ἡδονὴν ? ? | τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὖ | -[σα ?] ἢ πονηρὰν ἢ | -[γεῦσ]θαι. ἥκιστα <·> δὲ ἀν | [τι]ς νέος ὁν τοιοῦ | 5 | -[τόν] τ[ε] ἐπιτηδεύ- | -[οι.] περὶ δὲ τῶν ποι- | -[ητ]ῶν ἢν ἔχω γάνω | -[μηγ]νέων. ἥδη γάρ | [πολ]λῶν ἥκουσα | 10 | [ος] ἔστιν ὠφέλιμον | το]ς ποιήμασιν | [όμιλ]ειν ἀ οι πρότε- | -[ροι κα]τέλιπον. | [ει] γαρ ἀπ' αὐτῶν | 15 | ὠφελία]ν είναι . . .

Das Unterstrichene wird auf dem Fr. F. gelesen. Z. 1-3 erg. ich, Z. 4-11 und 13 Grenfell-Hunt; Z. 12 ὀμιλεῖν ich, ἔντυχεῖν (Aorist!) Blass, Z. 14-15 ich.

COL. II.

— — — [περὶ τῶν] | [κα]λῶν καὶ αἰσχρῶν, | περὶ τῶν δικαίων[ν] | καὶ ἀδίκων, περὶ τῶν θείων περὶ τῶν | 5 | ἐν Ἀιδον, περὶ γονῆς ἀνθρώπων | περὶ εἰκόνων | - μάτων. εἰκόνας γάρ | [οι]δηγ [πᾶ]σιν [έκμιμει] | 10 | - σθαι ἀνθρώποις ἀ? | - περὶ τ—— | ποιητ——

Z. 1-4 erg. Gr.-H., Z. 5-10 erg. ich (Z. 9 ο]δηγ Westermann, brieflich).

¹ *Hermes* LIII., 1918, S. 418.

² Siehe meine Studien zur Geschichte der antiken Traumdeutung, *Bull. de l'Acad. des Sciences de l'URSS*, 1927, 1064-66.

³ Im Aufsatz 'Wann hat Demokrit gelebt?' welcher im *Archiv für die Geschichte der Philosophie* bald erscheint.

⁴ Vgl. noch meine soeben genannten Studien, *l.c.*, S. 1072, A. 2. Ähnlichen Gedanken begnügen wir auch bei Philodemos, Über die Gedichte, V. (hrsgb. v. Chr. Jensen, Berlin, 1923), z. B. II.: (der Gegner) φαίνηται πᾶσαν

[άπαγγειλαν πραγμάτων ὑπολαμβάνειν φέλειν, [οἱ φανερῶς φεῦδόις ἐστιν. [εἰ] δὲ [εο]τιν τις ἀν[ωφ]ε[λ]ής, οὐδὲν καλό[ει τα]βό[τα] εἰδότα καὶ ποτη[κ]ῶς ἀπαγγέλλοντα τότε ποητὴς μηδέδην φέλειν]. Doch kann unser Bruchstück nicht auf Philodem oder einen anderen Epicureer zurückgehen: außer sachlichen Gründen, die ich bald anderorts zu besprechen hoffe, spricht dagegen die Schreibung ξυρ . . ., die sich weder bei Philodem noch überhaupt in der späteren Literatur findet.

COL. III.

— — — [οὐ] | [π[ροεπιμ[ταμένωι] | τ[ι] περὶ τ[ῶν ἀνδρῶν] | τῶν πρὶν τοῦ ποιη] | - τοῦ
ἀκοῦσα[ι]. καὶ ποι[5]-ητής μοι δ[οκ]εῖ ἀ]- πὸ τοι[ητοῦ ἀ]μεί | - νων ἀν γενέσθαι, | στὴρ δ'
[ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς] | ἀν δε[ι?

Z. 1-3 erg. ich, Z. 4-6 Gr.-H., Z. 7 H. Gomperz brieflich ('ein guter Dichter wird man durch das
Vorbild guter Dichter, ein guter Bürger aber durch das gute Bürger oder Sophisten !').

LENINGRAD.

S. LURIA.

I HAVE
vulgate no
call atten
Hermann'
Hermann'
could be u
'mutual h
'mutual vi
against th
διὰ τὰς ἐ^ν
renders 'a
I do not k
of successi
of calamit
this is qui
world (acc
I must tak
p. 253, to
Stoic. II. 3
τηροῦσαν τ
passages f
If cor
χεροῦν is fa
Ant. 7

For re
δποία as eg
leads to th
and an ack
wisdom. S
the weakne
ambition a
this but th
my brother
but neverth
your pains
the Greeks
qualities (s
or even to
δὲ τόλμας μ
Musgrave
to the Soci
ἰσθ' ὄποία

SOPHOCLES' ANTIGONE.

Ant. 57:

αὐτοκτονοῦντε τῷ ταλαιπώρῳ μόρον
κοινὸν κατειργάσαντ' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοιν χεροῖν.

I HAVE little to say on this passage, where it seems necessary to maintain the vulgate notwithstanding its obvious defects. My only reason for discussing it is to call attention to the strangeness of Jebb's proceeding when seeking to support Hermann's conjecture ἐπαλλήλου which he admits into the text. The objection to Hermann's view is that, as he himself admits, there is no evidence that ἐπάλληλος could be used in the sense of ἀλληλοφόρος. For that, I suppose, is the meaning of 'mutual hands,' which both Jebb and Campbell suggest as a translation, although 'mutual violence' would be better. But the chief purpose of this note is to protest against the mode of interpretation applied to *Philo de Mose* 3. 36. II. p. 175 M. διὰ τὰς ἐν ὕδαις καὶ πυρὶ γενομένας συνεχεῖς καὶ ἐπαλλήλους φθοράς Turnebus rightly renders 'alternas internecciones,' and why Jebb supposes him to have meant 'mutual' I do not know. Anyhow he admits that Philo used the word in its ordinary sense of successive, and proceeds to paraphrase 'owing to the continuous and rapid succession of calamities by flood and fire' (J.'s italics: observe the addition of *and rapid*). All this is quite beside the mark, for the reference is to the *alternate* destruction of the world (according to the Stoics) at the ἐκπύρωσι by fire and at the ἐξύγρωσι by water. I must take leave to refer to the evidence collected in my book on Zeno and Cleanthes, p. 253, to which should be added a most instructive passage of Origen (Chrysipp. Stoic. II. 337, 32 v. Arn.): ὁ περὶ τῶν κακῶν λόγος οὐ μενόντων δὲ ἐν ταντῷ διὰ τὴν ἥτοι τηροῦνταν τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς πρόνοιαν ἡ κατακλυσμοῖς καὶ ἐκπυρώσεσι καθαίρονταν. Add the passages from Lucan quoted by Mr. Heitland in his Introduction, p. xlivi.

If correction is needed, Hartung's proposal to invert the positions of *μόρον* and *χεροῖν* is far the best.

Ant. 71:

ἀλλ' οὐθ' ὅποιά σοι δοκεῖ, κεῖνον δ' ἐγὼ
θάψω.

For reasons convincing to its expounders the preponderance of authority favours *ὅποια* as against *ὅποια*. I propose to submit that a careful appreciation of the context leads to the contrary conclusion. Ismene's whole case is based on common sense and an acknowledgment of the hard facts of the situation—in other words, on worldly wisdom. She starts by demanding recognition (*φρόνησον*, 49) of the family history and of the weakness of their own position (*ἐννοεῖν*, 61), and concludes by rebuking extravagant ambition as senseless (*περιστὰ πράσσειν οὐκ ἔχει νοῦν οὐδένα*, 68). Antigone admits all this but thrusts it aside. 'You may be convinced of what you will; yet will I bury my brother.' She allows that her defiance is imprudent (*τὴν ἐξ ἐμοῦ δυσβουλίαν*, 95), but nevertheless she will not yield. 'Very well,' answers Ismene, 'you are a fool for your pains (*ἀνοις μὲν ἐρχῃ*); but I love you all the same.' In view of the fact that the Greeks did not draw a sharp distinction between the moral and the intellectual qualities (see on frs. 925, 985, 1059), it is unnecessary to boggle over *ἀθεμίστια εἰδώς*, or even to consider how far current usage as evidenced in *Ant.* 301, *Trach.* 582 *κακὰς δὲ τόλμας μήτ' ἐπισταίμην ἐγώ*, Eur. *Hel.* 923 *τὰ δίκαια μὴ ἔξειδέναι* (= *iustitiam colere* as Musgrave pointed out), *I.T.* 1205 *πιστὸν οὐδὲν Ἑλλὰς οὐδὲν*, may have given an impetus to the Socratic identification of virtue with knowledge. It is difficult to believe that *οὐθ'* *ὅποια σοι δοκεῖ* is Greek at all, and certainly Jebb's illustrations do not establish

anything of the kind. But, grammar apart, it is more forcible here and now for Antigone to say 'Be as wise as you please' than 'Be what you will.'

Ant. 110-113 = *Ant.* 127-130:

ὅν ἐφ' ἡμετέρᾳ γὰρ Πολυνείκης
ἀρθεὶς νεικένον ἔξι ἀμφιλόγων
οἵσα κλάζων αἰετὸς ἐς γάν
ώς ὑπερέπτα.

= Ζεὺς γάρ μεγάλης γλώσσης κόμπους
ὑπερεχθαίρει καὶ σφᾶς ἐσιδῶν
πολλῷ βεύματι προσνισομένους
χρυσοῦ καναχῆς ὑπεροπτίας.

Such, in substance, is the text of L. in this disputed passage. Jebb admits the following alterations: 110 ὃς . . . Πολυνείκος (after Scaliger); 112 sq. οἵσα κλάζων as a monometer with αἰετὸς ἐς γάν transferred to the following line; 130 ὑπεροπτίας Vauvilliers (ὑπεροπτίας Dorville) following ὃς ὑπεροπτίοι of *Hom. A* 205.

It will be recognized that the chief flaw in this passage is the fact that strophe is shorter than antistrophe to the extent of an anapaestic monometer. Jebb brushes this aside on the ground that 'the correspondence between anapaestic systems is not always strict.' But if these anapaests are lyrical—i.e. closely interwoven with the parts which are undoubtedly lyric—we expect to find a general metrical correspondence, a consideration which serves to account for the Doric forms (obliterated by Dindorf) which are preserved in the MSS. The conclusion seems inevitable that there is a lacuna somewhere in this neighbourhood, and that this contained the verb the absence of which induced Scaliger's alteration. Next, although ἀρθεὶς might seem to fit αἰετός, it is by its position well suited to mark the etymology of Polynices' name, while its technical significance as denoting the starting of a hostile expedition must not be forgotten (= set in motion); cf. *Hdt. I.* 170. So the position of the lacuna is fixed as following ἀμφιλόγων. Now observe the schol. on 110: ὄντινα στρατὸν Ἀργείων ἔξι ἀμφιλόγων νεικένον ἀρθεὶς ἥγαγεν ὁ Πολυνείκης. Surely this implies that ἥγαγεν or its synonym was one of the lost words, and justifies the critics who are cited in Jebb's critical note. In 113 Hermann struck out ὃς (ώς) on the ground that it was added by the metricalians to fill up the paroemiac. Agreeing that ὃς was probably an intruder, I should prefer to suppose that it was an intrusive gloss to mark the simile: 'with a shrill cry like an eagle's.' I have called attention to this phenomenon in a note on *Soph. fr. 279, C.Q. XIII.* 119. It must of course be noticed that if v. 130 is a complete (acatalectic) dimeter no change can be made here. In the antistrophe ὑπεροπτίας is a *vox nihili*, and the choice lies between ὑπερόπτας, which has some MS. authority and is palaeographically very easily confused with ὑπεροπτίας, and ὑπεροπτίας. The schol. recognizes ὑπεροπτίας, but his renderings suggest that he understood it as the equivalent of ὑπερόπτας (acc. plur.); for v. 130 is paraphrased τὴν τοῦ χρυσοῦ φαντασίαν ὑπερβεβηκότας τῇ ἴδιᾳ ὑπεροψίᾳ. Evidently he was labouring to give sense to what he found unintelligible. The majority favours the solution of Vauvilliers: 'in the haughty pride of clanging gold' (Jebb); but I confess that the reading ὑπερόπτας (-ης) as nominative singular appears to me simpler and more satisfactory. We thus arrive at the thought that the dazzling glamour of gold provokes the jealousy of heaven: *Aesch. Ag.* 770 τὰ χρυσόπτατα δ' ἔδεθλα σὺν πίνῳ χερῶν παλιντρόποις ὅμμασι λιποῦν' (*Δίκη*) ὅσια προσέφατο δύναμιν οὐ σέβοντα πλούτον παράσημον αἴνῳ; *Eur. Her.* 774 ὁ χρυσὸς ἀ τ' εὐτυχίᾳ φρενῶν βροτοῖς ἐξάγεται δύνασιν ἄδικον ἐφέλκων . . . ἔθραυσεν δλβον κελαινὸν ἄρμα, where κελαινόν points to unrighteousness sulling the gold. Wilamowitz shows how widely this conception prevails in Greek poetry.

Ant.

I h
in refer
and mu
καὶ καθρ
θηρίων ὁ
ἐὰν αὐτοῖ
(6. 8 στα
From th
ζεται, wh
Aristaen
Cf. Poll
στοιχίσα
καὶ στοιχ
excluded
στοχάζε
ἀμφίβλη
Ant.

Jebb
to himse
That the
ἀξέτ, are
None of
condemn
be follow
viated, a
Bast, pp
owing to
(3) The
Headlam
possible
(pres. in
explain in
cf. Plu.
θηρίων).
οὐρεοι w
that θ'
observe
statement
and the
For if so

Ant.

now for

Ant. 241:

εὐ γε στιχίζῃ κάποφάργυνσαι κύκλῳ
τὸ πρᾶγμα.

I have no doubt that Seyffert was substantially right in reading *στοχίζει* and in referring to Suid. v. *περιστοιχίζεται* which is practically identical with Harpocr. and much the same as E.M.: Δημοσθένης ἐν Φειλιππικοῖς (1. 9) μέλλοντας ἡμᾶς, φησί, καὶ καθημένους περιστοιχίζεται. ἐκ μεταφορᾶς τῶν κυνηγετῶν κατὰ γὰρ τὰς ἐκδρομὰς τῶν θηρίων ὅρθα ἔνδιλα ιστάσιν ἀ καλοῦσι στοίχους ή στόχους, καταπεταννύντες αὐτῶν δίκτυα, ἵν' ἔντος ἐκφύγη τὰ θηρία εἰς τὰ δίκτυα ἐμπέση, ὡς ὑποσημαίνει Ξενοφῶν ἐν τῷ κυνηγετικῷ (6. 8 στοιχιζέω) ἐν ἐνίοις μέντοι γράφεται περιστοιχίζεται, ἐν ἀλλοις δὲ καὶ περιστοιχονίζεται. From this I draw the inference that the vulgate text of Demosthenes gave περιστοιχίζεται, which is actually the form given by Harpocration's D (Paris. 2552). So in Aristeaen. 9. 2 περιστοιχίζετο is said to be a correction of the vulgate περιστιχίζετο. Cf. Pollux 5. 36 φάίς δ' ἀν στίσασθαι τὰς ἄρκυς . . . στοιχίσαι, περιστοιχίσαι, περιστοιχίσασθαι, καλέται δ' αὐτῶν ἡ στάσις στοίχος, καὶ στοχάς, καὶ στοχασμός, καὶ στοιχισμός. Since στοιχιζεσθαι (which occurs in Dem. 6. 27 as a passive) here is excluded by the metre, *στιχίζῃ* seems to deserve preference as against *στοχίζῃ* or *στοχάζῃ* (for the technical sense) having the support of Aesch. Ag. 1383 ἀπειρον ἀμφίβληστρον ὥσπερ ἱχθύων περιστοιχίων (περιστοιχίων F).

Ant. 347 sqq.:

κρατεῖ
δὲ μηχανᾶς ἀγραύλον
θηρὸς ὄρεστιβάτα λασιαύχενά θ'
ἵππον ὑπαξέμεν ἀμφίλοφον ἤγγδον
οἴρειόν τ' ἀκμῆτα ταῦρον.

Jebb's ἤγγδον is certainly wrong, as anyone can tell by reading the lines 350 sq. to himself. The series of lyric dactyls cannot possibly end with a long syllable. That there is a serious fault is clear from the apparatus: ἔξεται, ἀξεται, ἔξεται, ἔξετ', ἀξετ', are alike corrupt and show at what point corruption made its way into the text. None of the conjectures is satisfactory. Brunck's ὑπάξεται, otherwise attractive, is condemned by its tense, while Schöne's ὁχμάζεται, and Bellermann's ἐθίζεται cannot be followed by a double accusative (ἵππον and ἤγγόν). I suggest ὑπαξέμεν for the following reasons: (1) Some of the variants indicate that the termination was abbreviated, and the tachygraphic symbols for δι and εν may have been confused: see Bast, pp. 753, etc. (2) The epic form may have been adopted the more readily owing to the fact that ὑπάγειν ἵππος ἤγγόν was Homeric (II 148, Ψ 291, Ω 279). (3) The infinitive of result after κρατεῖ is normal: see Eur. *Hel.* 1639, and W. G. Headlam in *C.R.* XIV. 200. (4) It should be pointed out as emphatically as possible that the explanatory infinitive is very much better here than a finite verb (pres. indic. or gnomic aor.) since the object of these words λασιαύχενα—ταῦρον is to *explain* in detail the general assertion which precedes them (κρατεῖ—ὄρεστιβάτα): cf. Plu. *mor.* 98c οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τύχης οὐδὲ αἴτομάτως περίεσμεν αὐτῶν καὶ κρατοῦμεν (scil. θηρίων). That such is the case appears clearly from the use of λασιαύχενα and οἴρειον which revert to θηρός qualified as above. It is generally assumed, I suppose, that θ' in 350 links the finite verbs κρατεῖ and whatever ἔξεται stands for. But observe how extremely awkward this co-ordination of clauses is to unite the general statement with its specific applications. Surely they do not suppose that the horse and the bull are outside the class of wild animals whose taming is described in 347-349. For if so what are these animals? (5) For the form of the infinitive cf. 623 ἐμμεν.

Ant. 411 sq.:

καθήμεθ' ἀκρων ἐκ πάγων ὑπήνεμοι
όσμην ἀπ' αὐτοῦ μὴ βάλγ πεφευγότες.

Editors have chiefly concerned themselves with the explanation of ἀκρων ἐκ πάγων, and have consequently neglected to make clear their understanding of ἵπηνεμοι. In fact, they do not seem to have cleared their own minds. Thus Blaydes thinks that whereas ἵπηνεμοι means 'to leeward' or 'sheltered from the wind,' which is true, the sense requires προσηνεμοι 'to windward' which he thinks may be right. This seemingly perverse conclusion arises, I doubt not, from a refusal to contemplate the possibility of the watchmen deliberately turning their backs upon the object which they were appointed to guard. Others are less scrupulous. The schol. is quite plain in adopting the view from which Blaydes shrinks: ἀντὶ ἵπὸ τὸν ἀνέμον (below the wind) οὐκ ἐναντίον τοῦ ἀνέμον (to windward) ἀλλ' ἐστραμμένοι ἀπὸ τοῦ νεκροῦ. Even this is quite intelligible if we bear in mind that Didymus or another was using in an unsuitable context the common lexicographical gloss on ἵπηνεμοι. Though struggling hard, I have failed altogether to understand Campbell, who holds that they selected 'a point of observation on the lee-side of one of the (surrounding) hillocks, and to the windward of the corpse which they would have full in view.' I can only suppose that 'lee-side' and 'windward' are not used *in pari materia*. There is no mystery about this matter: the simple meaning is that they selected a spot *to leeward* of the corpse for the reason given in 412. It is a pity that Jebb, after explaining correctly, goes on to speak of the idea of 'sheltered' as applicable here if we suppose the guards to sit just below the summits of the πάγοι. But if so the spot selected would have been *to windward* of the corpse. The confusion becomes worse when he proceeds to deal with Xen. *Oecon.* 18. 6, 7 ἐκ τοῦ προσηνέμον μέρους as 'on the side *towards which* the wind blows, opp. to ἐκ τοῦ ἵπηνεμον to windward.' I suppose 'windward' must be a slip; for there is no doubt whatever about the meaning. Holden renders the phrases respectively as 'on that side which is next the wind,' and 'on the lee-side.'

The alternative adopted by Donaldson that the φύλακες were posted so far below the summits that the wind blew over their heads is open to the obvious objection that their position was chosen so as to give them the best possible outlook over the corpse and its surroundings.

Ant. 575 "Αἰδης ὁ παύσων τούσδε τοὺς γάμους ἔφυ.

So A reads in agreement with most of the *recentiores*: L substitutes ἔμοι for ἔφυ, but is followed only by the faithful F. On this Jebb remarks: The ἔφυ in the later MSS. was obviously a mere conjecture, and a weak one.' That is a question of taste, and I should reply that ἔμοι, although it can of course be *explained*, is an unnatural complement. But one requires a more objective standard, and if ἔφυ was a conjecture it was a very unusual one, whether proceeding from Alexandria (which no one now would suggest) or from Byzantium. If ἔφυ was an interpolation, how did it arise? On the other hand, scarcely any practice is so common as the superscription of an explanatory pronoun, which ultimately found its way into the text. Examples will be found in the remarks to be made on *Phil.* 150, where τὸ σόν is similarly intrusive, and in Starkie's edition of the *Acharnians* at p. lxxx. Nauck, reading λύσων in place of παύσων, substitutes μόνος for ἔφυ or ἔμοι. I cannot help thinking that the authors of such conjectures pay no regard to the improbability of their loss in the course of transmission.

Ant. 578 sqq. In support of Bruhn's ἐκδέτον it should be observed that there must have been some definite statement of *shutting up* the girls in order to justify the language employed in 580 sq.

Ant. 627 sqq.:

ἀρ' ἀχνύμενος
τάλιδος ἥκει μόρον Ἀντιγόνης,
ἀπάτης λεχέων ὑπεραλγῶν.

Most of the MSS. insert as a separate line after ἀχνύμενος the words *τῆς μελλογάμου νύμφης*. Metre requires at least the removal of *νύμφης*, and it ought not to be less certain that *τῆς μελλογάμου* is also part of the gloss on *τάλιδος*: cf. Hesych. IV. 126 *τάλις*. ἡ μελλόγαμος παρθένος . . . οἱ δὲ νύμφην. Phot. *lex.* *τάλιδος*. *τῆς μελλογάμου*. οὐτος Ἀριστοφάνης, which must surely be a reference to this passage with the inclusion of an explanatory gloss by Aristophanes of Byzantium. Pollux 3.45 is obscure, but does seem to indicate that Sophocles had *τῆς μελλογάμου* in his text. Eustath. 962, 54 ἡ παρὰ τῷ τραγικῷ τάλις (sic), τονέστι μελλόγαμος παρθένος, μελλονύμφη, id. 699, 26 ἡ παρὰ τῷ Σοφοκλέος μελλόνυμφος τάλις. The schol. quotes for the rare word *τάλις*, which he calls an Aeolism, from Callimachus (fr. 210): αὐτίκα τὴν τάλιν παιδὶ σὸν ἀμφιθαλεῖ, a line which after the lapse of centuries has appeared again in Oxy. pap. 1011, describing the love-story of Acontius and Cydippe. Jebb argues that *μελλογάμου* is not otiose here, inasmuch as the name *τάλις* was given to women recently married as well as to virgins, and that *τάλιδος* standing alone would have a crude effect. These are not strong arguments; but of course it cannot be shown that the addition of *τῆς μελλογάμου* as part of the text is impossible. The chief argument against it is the technical evidence which indicates it as being a gloss. It is abundantly clear that *τάλις* was a γλώσσα to the Alexandrians, and that Aristophanes (and probably others) appealed to the authority of Sophocles.

Ant. 663-667. The advantage of accepting Seidler's transposition of these verses so as to make them follow 671 is twofold. (1) *τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα* (668) follows immediately the words to which it properly applies (*οὗτος . . . ἄντρος* of 661 sq.), whereas in the vulgate it has to be twisted so as to refer to the indefinite subject of *κλένειν* in 666. The difficulty is not grammatical, as Jebb would make it, but consists in the absence of any proper connexion of 668 with the preceding sentence. (2) *ἄναρχίας* in 672 properly follows the duty of absolute obedience to the appointed rulers, as expressed in 666 sq. On the other hand, in the vulgate order 672 has no precise reference to what goes before, but must be taken as a general summary of the earlier part of the speech, at any rate from 655.

Ant. 773 sqq.:

ἄγων ἐρῆμος ἐνθ' ἀνὴρ βροτῶν στίβος
κρύψω πετρώδει λόσταν ἐν κατώρυχι,
φορβῆς τοσούτον ὡς ἄγος μόνον προθείσι,
ὅπως μίασμα πᾶντα ὑπεκφύγῃ πόλις.

There are two questions which it still seems necessary to investigate in this passage of notorious difficulty. The first is grammatical, relating to the analysis of *τοσούτον ὡς ἄγος*. The common view that we must treat *ὡς ἄγος* as the equivalent of *ὅτι* 'ἄγος εἴναι', as if there were some magic in the formula 'scil. εἴναι,' is justly condemned by Blaydes and Nauck. On the other hand, no one is convinced by such emendations as *ὅτον ἄγος φεύγειν*. It seems that *τοσούτον* cannot be correlative to *ὡς* (or to *ὅτως*, a tentative suggestion which I would now withdraw, although it is defensible from the grammatical point of view: cf. Arist. *pol.* I. 13 1260a 35 ἀρετῆς δέεται μικρᾶς, καὶ τοσαύτης ὅπως μήτε δι' ἀκολασίαν μήτε διὰ δειλίαν ἐλλειψή τῶν ἔργων, with Newman's note.)

There is no difficulty in understanding *ἄγος* as a *propitiation*: the evidence in support will be found in the note on Soph. fr. 689. Wilamowitz adopts this meaning in Aesch. *Cho.* 155, a difficult and doubtful passage. But there is another way open

if we are content to understand *τοσοῦτον* as absolute = just a little. The usage, though not common, may be illustrated by examples drawn from various sources: Hom. Δ 130 ή δὲ τόσον μὲν ἔργεν ἀπὸ χροός, where Leaf quotes several parallels; Dem. 4. 13 δεηθεὶς ὑμῶν, ὃ ἀνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τοσοῦτον; Pl. *Phaedr.* 271d ἔστιν οὖν τόσα καὶ τόσα, καὶ τοῖα καὶ τοῖα· ὅθεν οἱ μὲν τοιοῦτε, οἱ δὲ τοιοῦτε γίγνονται; Pl. *Alc.* I. 108ε βέλτιον τόδε τοῦδε καὶ νῦν καὶ τοσοῦτον; Adam's *Plato: Republic*, Vol. II. p. 283. *τοιοῦτον* similarly employed is frequent: Arist. *pol.* I. 8 1256a 37 θάλατταν τουαντην (*suitable for fishing*), *ib.* 9 1257b 29 ὁ τοιοῦτον πλοῦτος (*spurious wealth*).

Ant. 782 sqq.:

Ἐρως, ὃς ἐν κτήνεσι πίπτει,
ὅς ἐν μαλακαῖς παρειαῖς
νεάνιδος ἐννυχεύεις.

The general dissatisfaction with *κτήμασι* of the MSS. is sufficiently indicated by the numerous conjectures which are recorded. After adopting *κτήνεσι* I was glad to find that the same view had commended itself to Bruhn for the same reasons. He points out the parallelism in the successive periods of the strophe: *κτήνη* : *νεάνις*, sea : land, gods : mankind. The purpose of the first strophe is to make plain the universality of Love's dominion, a theme which the poet treats with greater elaboration in the famous fr. 941 and especially vv. 9-12. The same vein recurs in fr. 684. Add Eur. *Hipp.* 1274 sqq. θέλγει δ' Ἐρως . . . φύσιν ὀρεσκόν σκυλάκων πελαγίων θ' ὅσα τε γὰρ τρέφει; Aesch. *Cho.* 599 ἐνίζυγον δ' ὀμαλίας θηλυκρατής ἀπέρωτος ἔρως παρανικῆς κνωδάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν. Brunck's *κτήνεσι* was no more than a tentative query, but he would have been justified in pressing its claims. Here is what he wrote: Summa sententiae est *Amor omnia domat*, quod ostendit enumeratio animantium omnium, quorum uaria genera uel diserte nominantur, uel a sedibus quas incolunt, innuantur. Primo loco τὰ κτήματα, seu τὰ κτήνη nominat poeta. Si quid contra librorum fidem mutandum esset, pro κτήμασι legerem κτήνεσι. Hesych. *κτήνη*, *βοσκήματα*. Sed non uideo cur eadem significatio nomini κτήμα tribui non potuerit. . . . He proceeds quite perversely to suggest that in a choral ode such as this, which is akin to a dithyramb, the supposed use of *κτήματα* is all the more probable. This is quite wrong; for Brunck did not see that of the doublet *κτῆνος* : *κτῆμα* the former (and not the latter) is the Ionic and poetical form, tending to reappear in Aristot. and the κοινή. The only place that I know of where *κτήματα* seems to mean *live stock* is Arist. *pol.* I. 11 1258b 12 (altered to *κτήνη* by Bernays), and it is altogether improbable that Sophocles so employed it. How then did *κτήμασι* find its way into the text? The simple answer is that the rare word *κτήνεσι* was supplanted by its gloss. So in Aesch. *Ag.* 129 *κτήνη* is rightly or wrongly glossed by *κτήματα* in schol. M.

Ant. 795 sqq.:

νικᾶ δ' ἐναργῆς βλεφάρων
ἴμερος εὐλέκτρων
νύμφας τῶν μεγάλων πάρεδρος ἐν ἀρχαῖς
θεογόνων.

Apart from the metrical doubt as to the equivalence of *πάρεδρος* ἐν to *φύξιμος* (788), which involves the question whether resolution in an asclepiad is permissible, I do not see any serious difficulty in this passage, much as it has been canvassed, so long as we bear in mind the principle on which Headlam used to insist; that is, that an acknowledged commonplace appears again and again in Greek literature with variations in detail. Here we find (i) Love powerful, (ii) Love wisely regulated,¹ (iii) Love bursting free from his restraining bonds (*θεσμοῖς*). That *πάρεδρος* is sound with its implications is shown by the remarkable coincidence with Eur. *Med.* 844 τὰ σοφία

¹ This is implicit in *πάρεδρος*: 'though enthroned amidst mighty ordinances.'

ταρέδρους ἔρωτας, παντοίας ἀρετᾶς ἔννεργούς. Love is one of the mighty elemental powers which may be directed to a good end if temperately handled: Eur. fr. 897 παιδευμα δ' ἔρως σοφίας ἀρετῆς πλείστον ὑπάρχει, καὶ προσομιλεῖν οὐτος ὁ δαίμων πάντων ηδυτος ἔφυ θυητοῖς καὶ γὰρ ἀλυπον τέρψιν τιν' ἔχων εἰς ἐλπίδ' ἄγει . . . τὸ δ' ἔραν προλέγω τοισι νέοισι μήποτε φεύγειν χρῆσθαι δ' ὅρθως, σταν ἐλθῃ. Observe that ἔρως as παιδευμα is suggestive by way of contrast with νικῆ δ' ἐναρχῆς ἵμερος. Eur. fr. 388 ἀλλ' ἔστι δῆ τις ἄλλος ἐν βροτοῖς ἔρως ψυχῆς δικαίας σώφρονός τε κάγαθῆς καὶ χρῆν δὲ τοις βροτοῖς τὸν δ' εἶναι νόμον τῶν εἰσεβούντων οἵτινες τε σώφρονες ἔραν. Love should be regulated in partnership with the sanctions of the eternal laws: πάρεδρον . . . ὡς κατακρατοῦντα ἀνθρώπων, καθάπερ καὶ τὰ μεγάλα παρὰ τῶν θεῶν νόμιμα (schol. rec. p. 318 Dind.). The puzzle is for human passion to learn to adapt itself to its conditions. Thus it will be seen that Plato's allegorizing in the *Phaedrus* is a reflex of popular thought; see W. H. Thompson on 253B οἱ δὲ Ἀπόλλωνός τε καὶ ἑκάστον τῶν θεῶν οὐτῷ κατὰ τὸν θεὸν ιόντες ἅγιοισι τὸν σφέτερον παῖδα πεφυκέναι κ.τ.λ. Nevertheless Love cannot be constrained without disaster: A.P. 5 θεσμὸν Ἐρως οὐκ οὐδὲ βιημάχος· οὐδέ τις ἄλλη ἀνέρα νοσφίζει πρῆξις ἐρωμανίης. Eur. fr. 340 Κύπρις γὰρ οὐδὲν νουθετουμένη χαλᾶ, ἦν τ' αὐτὸν βιάζει μᾶλλον ἐντείνειν φιλεῖ. When once Love becomes violent, its might is irresistible; see below on 800. The anapaests which follow mark the return to Antigone's particular disaster, and the use of θεσμῶν in 801 has an obvious significance.

Ant. 800:

ἄμαχος γὰρ ἐμπαίζει θεὸς Αφροδίτη.

The difficulties of the words preceding this extract seem to have monopolized the attention of the critics, so that they have been at little pains to determine the meaning of ἐμπαίζει. The Schneidewin-Nauck edition, to which we generally look for light, disdains even to notice the words quoted above. Yet if they are pondered and weighed, the questions which they provoke are not easy to answer. Jebb explains: 'wreaks her will' in that contest which νικῆ implies, and proceeds to discuss the possible applications of ἐν in the compound. But, even apart from the preposition, the phrase ἄμαχος παῖςει, if understood as 'irresistibly wantons,' is not altogether apt to the context. Hence, since ἄμαχος is beyond reproach, they seek to neutralize ἐμπαίζει. Therefore the existence of a possible variant deserves very serious consideration. It is well known that in the margin of an Aldine edition of Sophocles which was presumably in the Vatican a series of notes containing the readings of two MSS. (styled p and v) and other matter were inscribed by John Livineius (1546-1599). The notes were first published in the *Classical Journal* XIV. (Vol. VII.) 428, and a selection of them will be found in the Preface to Elmsley's edition (1825) of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. The collations were sent to the editor of the *Classical Journal* by an anonymous critic who signs himself 'Ctesiphon.' Now on O.T. 1252 εἰσέπαστε (εἰσέπεστε rec.) Livineius cited Eur. *Hec.* 16. 4, *Ant.* 198. 25. Ctesiphon remarks that the former passage is *Hec.* 116, where ξινέπαστε has been restored for ξινέπεστε from the Byzantine scholia. He adds that Livineius either made the same correction or found it in his sources, and that the latter citation is made from *Ant.* 799. The inference here also seems inevitable that Livineius conjectured ἐμπαίζει if it was not actually in the text of p or v. The former alternative appears to be true, since nothing is quoted from Livineius on *Ant.* 800. But that is not all. After quoting *Ant.* 799 ἄμαχος—Αφροδίτη Ctesiphon continues: 'ubi gl. πίπτει siue ἐμπίπτει.' The inwardness of this is explained by Ctesiphon's admission: 'Besides the various readings there are many interlineary glosses and some scholia, both of which I have usually neglected, as the former are unimportant, and the latter differ but little from those already printed. Both seem to have been taken from the MS. marked v, as with only one exception they are confined to the four first plays, beyond which that MS. is not quoted.' The existence of these glosses is, I think, a conclusive proof

that ἐμπαίει was an old variant. We have seen how readily the rarer forms ξυνέπαιον and εἰσέπαιον gave way to ξυνέπεσεν and εἰσέπεσεν, and in *El.* 902 the only passage quoted for ἐμπαίει in this sense the Byzantine scholia give the paraphrase καὶ εὐθὺς ἡ τάλαινα, καθὰ εἰδον, ἐμπίπτει τῇ ψυχῇ μον τεκμήριον κ.τ.λ. Having established, as I hope, the authority of ἐμπαίει, I plead for its acceptance as actually more appropriate than ἐμπαίζει. Surely the theme of the whole passage is the universal power of Aphrodite—evidenced here by her irresistible assault—rather than by her invincible mockery. It is the violence of her attacks which is so deadly to her victims. If you want to know what Sophocles thought of love, I would recommend a careful perusal of the magnificent fr. 941, so much more illuminating and less familiar than the similar evidence of Eur. *Hipp.* 443 Κίτρις γὰρ οὐ φορτός, ἦν πολλὴ ρυγή and Hor. *Od.* I. 19. 9 *in me tota ruens Venus*.

If it be objected that it is very improbable that ἐμπαίει was altered to ἐμπαίζει, then, apart from the general similarity of the two words and the greater familiarity of the latter, I would point out that in *Phil.* 688 κλύων is supported by almost overwhelming authority, although κλύειν is unquestionably right. Conversely in Aesch. *Ag.* 1182 κλύειν is given by the MSS. and was corrected to κλύζειν by Auratus.

Ant. 839 :

τί με, πρὸς
θεῶν πατρών,
δλομέναν LA rec. : δλλυμέναν rec. οὐκ οἰχομέναν ὑβρίζεις ;

There are three possible courses, none of which is free from objection. (1) The retention of the δλομέναν offends against the metre—838. It makes no difference if we divide the cola as recommended by Wilamowitz (*Verskunst*, p. 519) and Rupprecht (p. 77). (2) οὐλομέναν was proposed by Turnebus and Jacobs, not by Triclinius as is commonly stated. But there is no evidence that it could be used as the equivalent of δλομέναν, unless it be that LP give οὐλομέναν in *I.A.* 793. (3) There seems, then, to be no escape from the adoption of Martin's οἰχομέναν, although I have searched in vain for evidence of οἰχομέναν glossed by δλωλα, etc. The probable gloss would be τέθνηκα (ἀποθανών, etc.): schol. Eur. *Hec.* 139.

Ant. 848 :

ἔργυμα.

The reading ἔργυμα is not in V (*Ven.* 467), if Castellani's collation is to be trusted. What Jebb means by his reference to Par. 11 I have been unable to discover. No one else seems to refer either to the MS. or to the variant ἔρυμα.

Ant. 850 sqq. : Dindorf supposes that the words οὐτ' ἐν βροτοῖσιν . . . ἐν νεκροῖσιν, which are the reading of the best MSS., are an emblema intended to patch an accidental lacuna. This is the policy of despair, but any attempt at restoration must necessarily be provisional. The reading adopted in the text satisfies the requirements of metre at the least cost. The assumption that νεκρός was lost by haplography is not violent; and if the text stood originally as supposed, passing to βροτοῖς οὐτ' ἐν νεκροῖσιν, the addition of οὐτ' ἐν in the margin or above βροτοῖς was a natural act of exegesis.

Ant. 855: προσέπαιον, although not recorded by Jebb, is the reading of several of the recentiores, and was the vulgate until Erfurdt introduced προσέπεσεν. But for the weight of authority in favour of προσέπεσεν, I should have felt no doubt that it was a gloss on προσέπαιον as it stands in T. It ought to be sufficient to refer to Porson and other critics on Eur. *Hec.* 116 when συνέπεσεν is the reading of all the important MSS., and Murray refers the correction to the Byzantines. Brunck quotes a gloss προσέκρουντας without saying from what source he derives it, and the same interpretation

(on παίζειν in the other hand, is, I think)

Ant.

The simple fact is that were of the Nauck, pretation to follow provide

Ant.

The parallel 298 οὐ rogative

Ant.

C.Q. X. restoration required unnatural Σαλμυδάς it would be dangerous δ' οὐτοις extend it to Pont. Θράκες περὶ τὸν

Ant.

change previous this critic

Ant.

The rejecting eclecticism more likely Aesch. MSS. but usum' textual

(on *πάντας*) is given by schol. B on Aesch. *Prom.* 885. A mass of information tending in the same direction will be found by the curious in Greg. Cor. p. 403. On the other hand, of course, *προσέπεντες* is possible (Plut. *Mor.* 549D), but the evidence is, I think, against it.

Ant. 883 sq.:

ἀρ' ἵστ' ἀοιδᾶς καὶ γόους πρὸ τοῦ θανεῖν
ὡς οὐδὲ ἄν εἰς παύσαιτ' ἄν, εἰ χρείη, λέγων.
λέγων Vauvilliers: λέγειν codd.

The critics show signs of uneasiness in the interpretation of these comparatively simple lines. Thus on *εἰ χρείη* Wunder prefers *if it were allowed* to Schaefer's *if it were of use*, though neither is admissible. Hence, too, Blaydes's *παύσειν* approved by Nauck, and the same scholar's monstrous *'ξείη*. The key to the correct interpretation of the passage will be found if we observe that the infinitive required to follow *εἰ χρείη* is not *λέγειν* but *μὴ παύσασθαι λέγοντα*. Then all is straightforward, provided that we accept the trivial remedy of *λέγων* for *λέγειν* (*O.T.* 1170, etc.).

Ant. 885 sqq.:

οὐδὲ ἄξετε . . . καὶ . . . ἄφετε.

The co-ordination of the imperative with the future indicative in a command is paralleled by Plat. *Prot.* 338A, *ὡς οὖν ποιήσετε, καὶ πείθεσθε μοι ἐλέσθαι, etc.* Ar. *Nub.* 298 *οὐδὲ σκύψῃ μηδὲ ποιήσεις . . . ἀλλ' εὐφῆμει.* The explanation is that the interrogative future was felt as an imperative. See Sonnenschein in *C.R.* XVI. 167.

Ant. 966 sqq.: I have discussed the reading of the earlier part of this passage in *C.Q.* XIII. 125, and need not here repeat the reasons which seemed to favour the restoration of *σπιλάδουν* for *πελαγέων πετρῶν*. As for the rest, since a short syllable is required the Triclinian *ἰδ'* seems preferable to *ἢδ'*, and the hiatus before *ἰδ'* is not unnatural considering its frequency in Homer. To fill the gap – *ο* – before Σαλμωνός I have adopted Meineke's *ἡών*, which is the best supplement (1) because it would be easily lost after Θρηκῶν; (2) because Salmydessus is described as dangerous precisely on account of its exposed and shallow beach. Strabo 319, *ἐστι δ' οὗτος ἔρημος αἰγιαλὸς καὶ λιθώδης, ἀλίμενος, ἀναπεπταμένος πολὺς πρὸς τοὺς βορέας, extending about 700 stades μέχρι Κνανέων.* Xen. *Anab.* 7. 5. 12: many ships sailing to Pontus are wrecked at S.: *τέναγος γάρ ἐστιν ἐπὶ πάμιτον τῆς θαλάσσης. καὶ οἱ Θρᾷκες οἱ κατὰ ταῦτα οἰκοῦντες κ.τ.λ.* with which cf. *Hdt.* 4. 63. Hesych. s.v. *αἴγιαλὸς περὶ τὸν Εὔξεινον πόντον.*

Ant. 994: *τήνδ' ἐνανκλήρεις.* Blaydes and Jebb after Valckenaer. But the change is not necessary, if, taking into account the influence of *πάρος* from the previous line, we are prepared to render; therefore *up to now you have been directing this city.* The evidence in justification will be found in Gildersleeve § 202.

Ant. 999:

θάκον L; θῶκον A.

The divergence of the MSS. raises a doubt whether we have been doing right in rejecting the Ionic form where there is some evidence in its favour. If we are to be eclectic, not adhering strictly to the evidence of a favourite codex, which form is the more likely to have been interpolated? For this passage does not stand alone. In Aesch. *Prom.* 279, *Ag.* 519 *θᾶκος* alone is supported by authority, but in *Prom.* 831 all MSS. have *θῶκον*, and Wilamowitz notes: "notabilem ionismum contra tragicorum usum" (v. *supra*) "servare non audeo." Probably Wilamowitz was not aware of the textual variation here or that *θῶκον* has the support of L in *Trach.* 23. In Euripides

I find no evidence of $\theta\hat{\omega}k\hat{o}s$ except that it is superscript by P^a in *I A* 195. But it is remarkable that there is some, though not strong, evidence in favour of $\theta\hat{\omega}k\hat{o}s$ in *Ar. Nub.* 993, *Ran.* 1515, 1522. All those occur in Anapaestic systems, and all recent editors have preferred $\theta\hat{\omega}k\hat{o}s$. Probably they are right, but the balance of the scale does not incline readily.

Ant. 1032:

ηδιστον εῦ λέγοντος εἰ κέρδος φέρει.

$\phi\hat{e}re\iota$ appears in Brunck's text, but since $\lambda\acute{e}go\iota$ was introduced by Dindorf from L it has been entirely ignored. $\phi\hat{e}re\iota$ is supported by E^{ac} Vat Lb Ven d T (so that it is not merely a Triclinian conjecture) and $\phi\acute{e}ro\iota$ by Ven d^s Aug. Even if they are merely Byzantine variants, $\phi\hat{e}re\iota$ is so much superior to $\lambda\acute{e}ge\iota$ that at any rate it deserves mention. I should suppose $\lambda\acute{e}ge\iota$ (*oi*) to be a mere blunder or an extremely stupid gloss, but whatever may be the truth it is no occasion for dogmatism. As between $\phi\hat{e}re\iota$ and $\phi\acute{e}ro\iota$ I must take leave to refer to my n. on Soph. fr. 836 or Bruhn's *Anhang*, § 143. The optative is peculiarly Sophoclean, and perhaps deserves the preference.

Ant. 1092:

*ἔξ ὅτον λευκὴν ἔγω
τήνδ' ἐμελαίνης ἀμφιβάλλομαι τρίχα.*

Jebb gives two versions: (1) since my hair has become white, (2) since hair has clothed my head—i.e. from infancy—and rightly prefers the former. But in the latter part of his note he fails to observe that the reference is to the *wisdom* of grey hairs, which was proverbial (*App. Prov.* 4. 6 *νέοις μὲν ἔργα βολλὰς δὲ γεραιτέρους*). This is also the point of Rhianus' epigram (*A.P.* 12. 93) which is quoted to illustrate $\acute{a}mphiβállomai$. The phrase is practically equivalent to 'since I have come to years of discretion.'

Ant. 1102: $\delta\acute{o}ke\iota\pi\acute{a}k\acute{a}th\acute{e}i\acute{v}$ is convincingly defended as against the necessity of substituting $\delta\acute{o}ke\iota$ by A. T. Murray in *Class. Philol.* V. 488-493. Exactly the same question arises in *Ran.* 1220. While admitting that *moi δok\hat{o}* is usually accompanied with fut. infin. or aor. with $\acute{a}v$, Murray pleads that the canon is not of universal application, though he refuses to accept *Eg.* 1311 *καθῆσθαι moi δok\hat{o}* as sound. Jebb's statement that $\delta\acute{o}ke\iota\pi\acute{a}k\acute{a}th\acute{e}i\acute{v}$ cannot mean 'dost thou think it right that I should yield?' is decisively rebutted by *Nub.* 1415 *κλάουσι παιδες, πατέρα δ' οὐ κλάειν δοκεῖς.*

Ant. 1123:

ναιετῶν παρ' ὑγροῖς Ἰσμηνοῦ ῥείθροις ἀγρίου κ.τ.λ.

The metre requires a long syllable at the end of $\rho\acute{e}i\theta\acute{h}rois$, so that $\rho\acute{e}i\theta\acute{h}ro\iota$ cannot stand. $\acute{u}γροi\acute{s}$. . . $\rho\acute{e}i\theta\acute{h}rois$ is perhaps arbitrary; but nothing better has been suggested, and Triclinius' $\acute{u}γρῶν ρέεθρων$ is an impossible use of the genitive (cf. 966 discussed in *C.Q.*). It would be an advantage from the diplomatic point of view to substitute $\acute{u}γροi\acute{n}$. . . $\rho\acute{e}i\theta\acute{h}ro\iota$, if good reason could be shown for the introduction of the dual. Now Thebes is described by Euripides as *διπόταμος* (*Suppl.* 662), and the two rivers are Ismenus and Dirce, *Bacch.* 5, *Phoen.* 825, *H.F.* 572, which, flowing east and west of the city, ultimately united their streams in the northern plain (what Jebb means by the *common source* of these two rivers south of the town [*Ant.* 103 n.] I do not understand). Ismenus was the father of Dirce, and their common waters might not unnaturally, even if illogically, be assigned to the parent river, to the exclusion of the tributary, somewhat as Dirce, chosen as representative Theban river, is inaccurately mentioned as lying in the course of an army invading from the

east (s)
'Ισμηνο
ἀρχήσα

An

praise
an obs
which
η in pl
οὐκ ἔστ
is inter
Wunde
6, and
ὑμῖν οὐν
schein
not to
οὐδείς i
The su
of the
the rec

A

passag
heal i
found
ξίφει
seriou
is stra
does n
cannot
the o
Helid.
suitab
Deian
fied by
corrup

was r
gloss i
menti
remar
both a

ut it is
ώκος in
recent
e scale

east (supr. 104). Cf. Callim. *h. Del.* 76 Δίρκη τε Στροφίη τε πελαμψηφίδος ἔχουσα
'Ισμην χέρα πατρός. Nonn. 44. 9 σὸν Ἰσμηνῷ δὲ τοκῆι κυκλάδας αἰθύσσουσα ῥάς
ώρχησατο Δίρκη. Sen. *Oed.* 238 *Dircen Ismenida*.

Ant. 1156 sq.:

οὐκ ἔσθ' ὄποιον στάντ' ἀνθρώπον βίον
οὐτ' αἰνέσαιμι ἀν οὐτε μεμψαίμην ποτε.

'There is no fixity in man's life (either for good or evil) such that I could either praise or blame it.' It is remarkable that no one of the commentators—apart from an obscure comment by Wunder—has given any attention to a use of the negative which so far as I can find is unique. For omit the negatives *οὐτε* . . . *οὐτε*, adding *η* in place of the second, and the meaning is exactly the same. Or, if we simplify, *οὐκ ἔστι βίος ὄποιον οὐκ ἀπανέσαιμι* should bear a meaning opposite to that which is intended and could not be justified in this context, as is shown by vv. 5 sq. which Wunder cites without seeing that it is against him. Kuehner-Gerth II. p. 206, Anm. 6, and Stahl. p. 787, quote Plat. *Apol.* 31E οὐ γάρ ἔστιν ὅστις ἀνθρώπων σωθήσεται οὐτε ὑμῶν οὐτε ἄλλω πλήθει οὐδενὶ ἐναντιούμενος, but that is less harsh, as Professor Sonnenschein has pointed out to me, since the negatives are attached to the participle and not to the main clause as here. The effect is the same as if *οὐδένα* in Sophocles and *οὐδείς* in Plato were substituted for *οὐκ ἔσθ' ὄποιον* and *οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις* respectively. The substituted words were regarded as giving additional emphasis, and the splitting of the negative statement into the alternative form gives the necessary opening for the redundant negative.

Ant. 1301 sqq.:

ἡ δ' ὁξύθηκτος ἡ δὲ βωμία πέριξ
λίνει κελαινὰ βλέφαρα, κωκύσσα μὲν
τοῦ πρὸν θανόντος Μεγαρέως κλεινὸν λέχος,
αὐθις δὲ τοῦδε, λοισθιον δὲ σοὶ κακὰς
πράξεις ἐφυμνήσασα τῷ παιδοκτόνῳ.

Such, apart from minutiae, is the reading of the MSS. in this much discussed passage. That the first line is grievously corrupt no one doubts, and the attempts to heal it will be found classified in Jebb's Appendix. Arndt's first emendation has found much approval, and is printed by Jebb in his text: *ηδ' οξυθήκτῳ βωμίᾳ περὶ ξίφει*. Its attraction is the neat removal of the suspected *πέριξ*, but there are several serious objections to its adoption. (1) The echoing phrase *ἀμφιθήκτῳ ξίφει* in 1309 is strange and pointless. (2) It anticipates the information given in 1315. (3) It does not account for the scholion on *οξύθηκτος*: *οξεῖαν λαβούσα πληγήν*. (4) *βωμίος* cannot be used adverbially without an appropriate predicate denoting position. On the other hand, *ημένη δὲ βωμία* has the support of Eur. *Suppl.* 93 *βωμίαν ἐφημένην*, *Helid.* 33 *καθέξμεσθα βώμοις*, ib. 196 *βωμίον καθημένον*, ib. 238 *βώμοις θακέεις*.¹ The suitability to the occasion of the mention of the altar is shown by the parallel case of Deianira in *Trach.* 904 *βωμοῖσι προσπίπτουσα*. Hartung's *οξύπληκτος* is amply justified by the schol. quoted above, which indicates that it was an old variant. The corruption I suppose to have arisen owing to the wrong division of letters: *ημένη δὲ*

was read as *η μὲν η δὲ* leading to *η μὲν* and ultimately to *η δὲ* alone. The *πέριξ* was a gloss intended to call to mind *ἀμφὶ βωμόν* and *ἀμφὶβώμος*. It is perhaps worthy of mention that Ven. 468 has on *βωμίᾳ πέριξ* the later gloss *περὶ τὸν βωμόν*. Jebb's remark that *πέριξ* was never common is incorrect: it is common enough in Plutarch both adverbially and otherwise, and occurs sporadically in the writings of the Atti-

¹ Why should not *βωμὸν πέριξ* (Eur. *H.F.* 243) have been added as a gloss to *βωμίᾳ*?

cists and once in the N.T. (Acts 5, 16). I see no reason, therefore, why it should not have served as a gloss or part of a gloss on *βωμία*. Add Hesych. δυσέα τοῦ τοίχου τὰ πέριξ.

Objection has been taken to *λύει*, and it is urged with some force that *μύει* (Bergk) or *κλύει* (Wiessler) should take its place. *λύει*, they say, should mean exactly the opposite of what is intended here, the opening and not the closing of the eyes, cf. *Rhes.* 8 λύον *βλεφάρων γοργωτὸν έδραν*. Jebb defends the text but is unable to cite a convincing parallel. Yet I find it difficult to believe that *λύειν βλέφαρα* could not express 'to let fall the curtains which darken the eyes,' 'to droop the darkling eyelids.' The sense required is that of the Homeric tag: *τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχή, καὶ δ' ὄφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἄχλις* (E 696).

The final difficulty attaches to 1303, where *κλεινὸν λέχος* of the MSS. is impossible if only because for all we know Megareus was not married at all, whereas Haemon's *λέχος* was certainly not *κλεινόν*. Bothe's *κλεινὸν λάχος* is no improvement (hence Blaydes's *αἰνὸν λάχος*), since it cannot possibly apply to Haemon. On the other hand, not only is Seyffert's *κενὸν λέχος* free from difficulty, but it repeats in other conditions the description of the mother bird whose nestlings have been destroyed, in 423 sqq.: *κάνακωνει πικρᾶς | ὄρνιθος δὲν φθόγγον, ὡς ὅταν κενῆς | εὐνῆς νεοσσῶν ὄρφανὸν βλέψῃ λέχος*. Note especially the echo in *κωκύσασα* of *κάνακωνει* in 423. The allusion completely justifies the choice of *λέχος* as = married state (cf. 573, 1225) where we might rather have expected a reference to Eurydice's motherhood. Observe that *Μεγαρέως* and *τοῦδε* are governed by *κενόν*, and how suitable is the introduction of Creon as the treacherous partner of her home. From *κενός* to *καινός* and thence *κλεινός* are easy stages: see Cobet *N.L.*, pp. 330, 334.

Ant. 1314: ποίψ δὲ κάπελύσατ' ἐν φονᾶς μόρῳ.

ἀπελύσατο is very strange after *ἔθανες ἀπελύθης* in 1268. What is the difference, or rather, how can the middle be right *without an object*? There is very little evidence either that *ἀπολύεσθαι* was used reflexively or absolutely with an ellipse of some such word as (e.g.) *ναῦν*. Compare, however, Hdt. 8. 59 (Themistocles and Adeimantos) δὲ ἀπολύμενος ἔφη 'οἱ δέ γε ἐγκαταλειπόμενοι οὐ στεφανοῦνται.' But that is scarcely adequate in view of the fact that *ἀπολύειν* was used transitively with *βίον* or the like as object so that as a passive *ἀπολύεσθαι* is normal. Cf. *A.P.* ix. 276 πνεῦμα δ' ὅμοι πενήγ *ἀπελύσατο*, Plut. *Anton.* 77 συντομώτερον ἐλπίζων *ἀπολυθήσεσθαι*. *Mor.* 241ε ἡ τὰς αἰτίας ἡ σεαντὸν τοῦ ζῆν *ἀπόλυστον*. The only possible remedy is to adopt *κάπελύστηκε*, and it may be that the schol. knew of this. If not why did he paraphrase *έλύνετο καὶ ἐφέρετο εἰς φονᾶς*? The imperfect would express: 'how did she contrive () (aor. = achieve) this bloody passing?'

A. C. PEARSON.

should
ο τοίχου

at μέν
l mean
of the
unable
βλέφαρα
oop the
ε ψυχή,

impos-
whereas
vement
On the
eats in
e been
| εὐνῆς
οκνεῖ in
ate (cf.
erhood.
is the
ο καιρός

erence,
vidence
the such
mantos)
hat is
Slov or
πνεῦμα
Mor.
adopt
phrase
ontrive
SON.

MARTIAL V. xvii 4.

GELLIA, of noble lineage, swore she would marry no one lower than a peer, but ultimately ('as men should serve a cowcumber') flung herself away on—whom? *Nupsisti, Gellia, cistifero*, say the two best families of MSS.; *nupsisti, Gellia, cistibero* says the third.

Now the three families of MSS. of Martial are not merely three Carolingian archetypes; they are three ancient editions. And when the two best of the trio agree, their reading should be right. But we know of an inferior magistrate called a *cistibero* (the official title of the guild was *quinqueviri cis Tiberim*), and the great Latin *Thesaurus* tells us something of his duties; and Professor Wissowa has recently discovered (*Herm.* 49, 627) that he was also a δειπνοκρίτης, whatever that may mean, possibly an 'approver of public banquets.'

We know nothing of any public official called a *cistifer*. The *Thesaurus* cites the word from inscriptions where it means 'qui in pompa cistam fert.' And we know of a coin of Asia Minor called a *cistophorus* (κιστοφόρος), the current Latin name of which might—or might not—be 'cistifer.' But a coin has nothing to do in this galley.

So an editor of Martial, willy nilly, suppresses his conviction that *cistifero* must be right and prints *cistibero*. All the same, he remembers that our knowledge of Roman officials is not complete. Some day—who knows?—the discovery of an inscription may add to their number a *cistifer*, and bring to the editor the same thrill of honourable pride as the Cairo papyrus (with ἀθλίων) brought to Professor Housman (*Lucan, Pref.*, p. xxx).

However, at present no jury would give a verdict for *cistifero*. The case being desperate, I hale into court Professor Thomson's emendation (*Glossaria Latina*, Vol. III.) of an item (VI 9) in the Abstrusa Glossary. The true form of the item is

Viocurus et cistifer nomina sunt metatorum,

and both this and another (ME 32),

Metatores : mansionum praeparatores,

seem to be chipped from a scholium of Donatus on *Geo.* 2, 274. METATORUM was miscopied (or misread) METALORUM, and this produced the *metallorum* of our MSS., a will-o'-the-wisp which led Professor Heraeus astray in his famous article (*Arch. Lat. Lexikogr.* XII. 27-93) on the *Lexicon Notarum Tironianarum* (ed. Schmitz, Leipzig. 1893). That article was written at a time when it was believed that each glossary was the work of some learned man who searched far and wide for words to fill its pages. Professor Heraeus imagined the compiler (e.g. of Abstrusa) to have drawn upon this lexicon of shorthand signs, but his three arguments are very weak. The first, that the 3 Sing. Pres. Ind. form of verbs is found in glossaries, as in *Not. Tiron.*, he would not use nowadays; for Professor Thomson shows (*Gloss. Lat.* III., Pref.) that this was the medieval way of mentioning a verb, just as we mention its 1 Sing. Pres. Ind. The second is the will-o'-the-wisp. The third is an item of the Ab Absens Glossary, *Secularius*, which I believe to come from a Latin version of the Philoxenus Glossary and to have been taken by Philoxenus from the *Liber de Officio Proconsulis* (see Laistner's edition of Philox. in Vol. II. of *Glossaria Latina*).

No; it is quite unlikely that any glossary drew material from *Not. Tiron.* The so-called *Glossae Isidori* certainly did, as Heraeus convincingly proves (after Kopp) in his article (p. 83). Their strange *Viocurus et statim cestifer* is probably a borrowing from *Not. Tiron.* (tab. 36), where the section on Names of Magistrates shows (No. 94)

Viocurus and (No. 95) *Cestifer*. But these *Glossae Isidori* are not a glossary; they are a Supplement to Latin Dictionaries, and have been collected by Scaliger and his contemporaries from all kinds of places—from the *Not. Tiron.*, from glossaries, from notes in modern editions of Latin authors, from inscriptions, etc.

Rather did the *Not. Tiron.* draw material from glossaries. When the study of shorthand was pursued with zest in Carolingian monasteries, teachers vied with each other in compiling as large a list as possible for their pupils. They would find words in *Hermeneumata*, in *Glossaries*, anywhere; and not merely words, but ghost-words, e.g. miswritten forms left by glossary scribes beside the corrected forms. In my preface to the *Ansileubus Glossary* (*Glossaria Latina*, Vol. I.) I warn readers against the tricks of Proteus in glossary transcription; and here I give warning against the argument: 'This or that strange form in *Not. Tiron.* must have been an actual word, since it appears also in a glossary.' Rather, *Not. Tiron.* took it from that glossary. And, no doubt, the teacher of shorthand produced ghost-words himself. The best way of impressing on a pupil's mind the symbol for—let us say—*praeclarus* would be to say: 'Here is the symbol for *praeclarus*; make this minute alteration, and it symbolizes *proclarus*,' and so on. How ludicrously absurd it is to take seriously all these things in the *Lexicon Notarum Tironianarum*! When I find in the great Latin *Thesaurus* each and every item of *Not. Tiron.* recorded with painful conscientiousness, that phrase of Terence (*Andr.* 21) occurs to my mind, *obscura diligentia*.

To return to *cistifer*. Since it cannot be said to be impossible that *Not. Tiron.* took its *viocurus* (36, 94) and *cistifer* (36, 95) from the *Abstrusa Glossary*, the advocate of *cistibero* will warn the jury against the evidence of *Not. Tiron.* Still, the advocate of *cistifero* is within his rights in reminding them that *cistifer* appears at the close of a section of Names of Magistrates: (36, 90) *quindecimviri*, (36, 91) *decemviri legibus iudicandi*, (36, 92) *quindecimviri satisfaciendi*, (36, 93) *septemviri epulorum*, (36, 94) *viocurus*, (36, 95) *cistifer*. The form is actually *cestifer* in the lexicon; but Heraeus shows that mis-forms are easily produced by a slight inaccuracy in the accompanying shorthand symbol.

We know who the *metatores* were—the officials who had charge of the *mansiones*, the halting-places in a general's or emperor's march or tour. One of the *metatores* was called *viocurus*. The meaning of that name is clear (*Varro, L.L.* 5, 1, 7). Another was called *cistifer*. Why?

W. M. LINDSAY.

they are
and his
ies, from

study of
with each
nd words
st-words,
In my
s against
ainst the
ual word,
glossary.
The best
would be
n, and it
ously all
at Latin
iousness,

ot. Tiron.
advocate
advocate
lose of a
i legibus
viocurus,
ows that
northand

naciones,
metatores
5, 1, 7).

NDSDAY.

MARCH 1, 50 B.C.

THE purpose of what follows is to show that if we assume March 1, 50 as the date on which ended the five years of *imperium* given to Caesar by the *Lex Licinia Pompeia*, we have a hypothesis which 'works,' in the sense that, as far as its relevance extends, it enables us to frame a coherent account of the dispute between Caesar and the Senate in the two years preceding the outbreak of civil war. The method followed will be to give a narrative based on that hypothesis and on the evidence which we possess. Many, at least, of the arguments and conclusions here adopted have been put forward already by various writers. I may mention, as an excuse for raising this question again (*quippe qui cum ueterem tum uulgatam esse rem uideam*), that a few suggestions will be made which I have not seen elsewhere. For the sake of clearness some very trite matters which belong to the years before 51 will first be recalled.

There is no initial difficulty about assuming that the five years of *imperium* which Caesar acquired by the *Lex Licinia Pompeia* began on March 1, 55. The *imperium* which this law gave him was to be exercised in the two Gauls and Illyricum; whereas that given him by the *Lex Vatinia*, to be held until March 1, 54, was for Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum only; until 55 his title to the Transalpine province was derived from the Senate, which annually prolonged his command there. It is likely enough that when Crassus and Pompey, in their consulship of 55, received, by the *Lex Trebonia*, their respective commands in Syria and the Spains, the five years of each were dated from March 1 of that same year, 55. Such a dating of their provinces (for which they had the precedent of the *Lex Vatinia*) may well have been the simplest means by which they could obtain the power to raise and dispose of troops in Italy during their consulship without reference to the Senate, on the excuse of reinforcing their provincial armies; and, in general, the sooner they came to hold their provincial commands, the sooner they would have the advantage of facing ill-will at Rome with armies at their backs and much patronage in their hands. But if the *quinquennia* of Crassus and Pompey were dated to run from March 1, 55 to March 1, 50, the new *quinquennium* of Caesar would naturally be dated in the same way. That would give the public the impression (which Caesar, in particular, was probably anxious to give it) of harmony and equality among the Three; and it would offer the best approach to the question, which would arise later, how power should be distributed again among the Three when their *quinquennia* ended.

But there was a danger from the Senate to be averted. It was a constitutional function of the Senate to make an assignment of provinces for each annual set of consuls and praetors, and by the *Lex Sempronnia de prouinciis consularibus* the Senate's choice of consular provinces could not be frustrated by the tribune's *intercessio*. Caesar certainly wished to put off for as long as possible the time when the Senate might claim to dispose of the Gauls; and no doubt Pompey and Crassus had the same feeling about their own provinces. For Caesar there was inserted in the *Lex Licinia Pompeia* a clause by which no *relatio* about sending him successors could be made to the Senate before March 1, 50 (*B.G. VIII. 53; Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 9*); and it is very likely that a similar clause was contained in the *Lex Trebonia*.

We can now pass to the year 52, the year of Pompey's third consulship, when he was engaged in the transition from partnership with Caesar to alliance with the optimates. Caesar wished to hold a second consulship in the year 48, when he would

be qualified to do so under the *Lex Cornelia annalis*. He did not wish to return to Rome before that year as a *priuatus*, for then he would be exposed to prosecution by his enemies. From making him leave his provinces before 48 the Senate was at present debarred by the clause just mentioned in the *Lex Licinia Pompeia*, taken in connexion with the existing rules *de prouinciis ordinandis*. As is well known, the Sempronian Law obliged the Senate to make its choice of consular provinces before their eventual holders had been elected to the consulship; and since Sulla's time it had been the rule that magistrates who received provinces by the regular senatorial assignment should not enter on their governorships till the year of their magistracy was over; so that on or after March 1, 50, the Senate could only arrange that the consuls to be elected in that year for 49 should take over the Gauls in 48. The assignment of praetorian provinces could be disabled by the tribunician *intercessio* (*De Prou. Cons.* 7, 17).

But in order to arrive at a second consulship without first coming to Rome, Caesar needed to have special leave to stand *in absence* in the year 49 for the consulship of 48. Early (it seems) in Pompey's consulship of 52 a law was passed giving Caesar that leave. From the fact that the bill was proposed by all ten tribunes, and from the ways in which Cicero and Caesar afterwards referred to its passing (*Ad Att.* VIII. 3, 3, and *B.C.* I. 32, 3), it is clear that this measure had Pompey's support. Why? It is possible that Caesar had for long held Pompey's pledge about this. Pompey may have promised at Luca that he would obtain this leave for Caesar, if the latter desired it, and (perhaps) if he himself chose to use his position at Rome to provide separately for the continuance of his own power, as he did in 52 by securing another *quinquennium* of command in the Spains (Dio. XL. 56). But it is also possible that as he already meant to manoeuvre Caesar into a certain kind of conflict with the Senate, he intended that the question which would be involved in that conflict should appear as the only issue between Caesar and himself. It is true that when later in the year he promulgated a bill *de iure magistratum*, it contained a general prohibition of candidature in absence, and that when a Caesarian protest induced him to except Caesar by name from this prohibition, the exception was so made that its validity was very doubtful (Suetonius, *Diu. Iul.* 28). But by that time he may have discovered something which we shall soon have to notice—namely, how the Caesarians could use the Law of the Ten Tribunes in the controversy started by the new regulations *de prouinciis ordinandis*.¹

It was by these regulations of the year 52 that Caesar was to be driven into choosing between submission to the Senate (to be followed by his political extinction) and civil war. In future there was to be an interval of some years between an individual's tenure of the consulship or praetorship and his governorship of a consular or praetorian province; and the Senate would now annually assign consular and praetorian provinces to be taken over by their holders—ex-consuls and ex-praetors—a few months after the senatorial assignment, and in the middle of the calendar year. There are two important points about this new arrangement. First, the Senate's choice of consular provinces might now be thwarted by the tribunician veto. Why did Pompey and the optimates give this advantage to Caesar? Professedly, of course, they were not preparing the means of breaking Caesar, but were introducing a reform, which was to stop the outrageous corruption practised in recent years by magistrates and candidates, eager to pass straight from a year of office at Rome to a lucrative provincial governorship. And now that the Senate was to have a power,

¹ This is not inconsistent with a belief that the new method of assigning provinces was established by this *lex de iure magistratum*. The change had been foreshadowed by a *senatus consultum* (Dio. XL. 56), and had therefore been

discussed in the Senate before a *lex* on the subject was drafted; so that when Pompey was preparing his measure the Caesarians may have already shown what interpretation they put on the Law of the Ten Tribunes.

which
shou
from
door
malic
suffic
empl
Senat
audie
9).²
Senat
seem
Senat
regula

early
consu
to be
either
fore, i
on Ma
to ma
provin
now c

By
taining

¹ As
In se
consul
prouinc
vinces
senior e
govern
8, 8 imp
ex-prae
provinc

² Som
lated th
lead in
Sullan r
optimat
time, se
be addre
had triec
succee
compre
with th
year—no
17); wh
keep his
for him
ment of
—a very

³ As t
the prov
evidenc
about ta

which it had lacked before, of determining *what* ex-consuls and *what* ex-praetors should receive governorships in a given year, to protect the assignment of provinces from tribunician interference could so easily have been denounced as opening a new door to jobbery, and as being, therefore, no genuine reform, but mere anti-Caesarian malice.¹ No doubt the enemies of Caesar thought that he would present a quite sufficiently scandalous spectacle to allow of their treating him as a *hostis*, if he employed a hireling tribune to keep him in his provinces against the authority of the Senate. In 51 Pompey was to say: *Hoc nihil interesse utrum C. Caesar senatui dicto audiens futurus non esset an pararet qui senatum decernere non pateretur* (*Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 9*).² The second point to notice about these regulations is that they prescribed to the Senate a new way of making its ordinary, periodical assignment of provinces; it seems clear that the aim of Caesar's enemies was to bring him into conflict with the Senate on a matter in which that body was merely attempting to perform one of its regular constitutional functions.

To illustrate this latter point we may now go on to the year 51. It was probably early in that year that the Senate made its assignment of provinces for 51-50.³ The consular provinces (Cilicia and Syria) were to be held for a year, and that year was to be reckoned from a date in the summer of 51 (probably July 1), or, in the case of either province, from any subsequent date on which its governor reached it.⁴ Therefore, if the term of command given to Caesar by the *Lex Licinia Pompeia* was to end on March 1, 50, the Senate could claim, at its next distribution of provinces, the right to make Transalpine Gaul, and Cisalpine Gaul with Illyricum, the two consular provinces for 50-49. And that this was indeed the prospect with which Caesar was now confronted, we shall find good reason to think.

But even so the Caesarians were not quite destitute of any argument for maintaining that Caesar had a right to stay in Gaul till 48. They said that the Law of

¹ As it was, Caesar said in 49 (*B.C. I. 85, 9*), *In se iura magistratum commutari, ne ex praetura et consulatu, ut semper, sed per paucos probati et electi in provincias mittantur*. Thus, for the consular provinces of 51-50, the Senate picked out the two senior ex-consuls who had not yet held consular governorships; and the decree of *Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 8* implies that it depended on the Senate what ex-praetors should draw lots for the praetorian provinces of 50-49.

² Some of the optimates may have even calculated that such a misuse of the tribunate might lead in the end to a happy restoration of the Sullan restrictions on the tribune's power. For optimates' feeling about the tribunate just at this time, see Cicero, *De Legibus III. 8-11*. It should be added that if under the old system the Senate had tried to decree in 50 that *pro-praetors* should succeed to the Gauls in 49 that would only have compelled Caesar to interfere, through a tribune, with the assigning of *praetorian* provinces in one year—nothing very unfamiliar (*De Prov. Cons. 7, 17*); whereas under the new system, if he was to keep his command till 48, it would be necessary for him (as we shall see) to thwart the assignment of *consular* provinces in two successive years—a very different matter.

³ As to the time at which the Senate decreed the provinces of 51-50, there is no quite definite evidence. Cicero's letter to Appius Claudius about taking over Cilicia (*Ad Fam. III. 2*) gives the

impression that it was written⁽¹⁾ just after Cicero had learnt that he would have to go to a province, and (2) when he was to enter on his governorship in the near future. It is at any rate apparent from *Ad Att. V. 20, 7* and *8*, that in 51 the Senate was expected to decree the provinces of 50-49 in March, 50, if it were not prevented from doing so by the dispute about the Gauls. Further evidence of this will be given later.

⁴ *Ad Fam. XV. 14, 5*: *Ad hanc prouinciam quam et senatus et populus annuam esse voluit. Ad Att. V. 15, 1*: *Laodiceam ueni pridie Kal. Sext. Ex hoc die clauum anni mouebis.* Cicero apologized to the authorities at Rome for not having reached his province before the last day of July *propter itinerum et navigationum difficultatem* (*Ad Fam. XV. 2, 1*). From *Ad Att. V. 16, 4*—*Bibulus ne cogitabat quidem etiam nunc* (towards the middle of August) *in prouinciam suam accedere. Id autem facere ob eam causam dicebant quod tardius uellet decedere*—it appears that both provinces were held on the same conditions as regards time. Bibulus seems to have reached Syria about the end of September or beginning of October (*Ad Fam. II. 10, 2*; compare *Ad Fam. III. 8, 10*). It is not unlikely that he dawdled on his way in order to supply his anti-Caesarian friends at Rome with an argument (for use in March, 50) against making Syria one of the consular provinces for 50-49.

the Ten Tribunes, as it allowed Caesar to stand in *absence* for the consulship of 48, implied that the Roman people was willing that he should remain in his command until that year began. If he were called on to leave his provinces before that year, the will of the Roman people, as expressed in that law, would be overridden. What right had the Senate to withdraw from Caesar a benefit which the people had chosen to grant him?¹

The consul M. Marcellus wished the Senate to make an authoritative pronouncement that might check this Caesarian propaganda. He wished the Senate to declare 'March 1' to be the *finis* of Caesar's Gallic command.² It is certain that he did not mean that Caesar should be made to give up his provinces before the end of the legal *quinquennium*—certain, in spite of Suetonius (*Diu. Iul.* 28), Appian (II. 26), and Dio. (XL. 59), who appear to have been confused by Caesarian assertions that Marcellus disregarded the 'plain meaning' of the *Law of the Ten Tribunes*. For to Pompey, as to the Caesarian Hirtius, there was nothing contrary to the *Licinian-Pompeian Law* in the *relatio* of Marcellus, apart from the time at which it was made. On the question whether it infringed the *Lex Licinia Pompeia*. All that Pompey had to say was, *Nullum hoc tempore senatus consultum faciendum* (*Ad Fam.* VIII. 9, 5), and *Se ante K. Martias non posse sine iniuria de prouinciis Caesaris statuere* (*ib.* 8, 9); all that Hirtius had to say was, *Marcellus . . . contra legem Pompei et Crassi rettulerat ante tempus ad senatum de Caesaris prouinciis* (*B.G.* VIII. 53, 1). But what exactly was the question that Marcellus intended to put 'about Caesar's provinces'? Did he hope to make the Senate decree that successors to Caesar should take over the Gauls on March 1, whether of 50 or of 49? It is incredible that he and those who approved of his action were so utterly and stupidly careless about breaking the *Lex Licinia Pompeia*, which did not allow any *relatio* for sending successors to Caesar to be made before March 1, 50. We may surely assume, while we wait to have it confirmed, that according to the plan of Marcellus the Senate was to declare (1) that March 1, 50, would be the end of Caesar's *legal* term of command; (2) that (as against the Caesarian argument) no account need be taken of the *Law of the Ten Tribunes* (Suetonius, *Diu. Iul.* 28, gives as part of the *relatio*, *ne absentis, sc. Caesaris, ratio comitiis haberetur, quod et plebiscito Pompeius postea obrogasset*³), and (3) that therefore on or after March 1, 50, the Senate could dispose of Caesar's provinces. In a sense the *relatio* was (as Caelius described it, *Ad Fam.* VIII. 1, 2) *de successione prouinciarum Galliarum*. But Marcellus could say that he was not breaking the *Lex Licinia Pompeia*, for the Senate was not yet being asked to decree the recall of Caesar. On that point of law Pompey disagreed with Marcellus and agreed with the Caesarians. But he quite agreed with Marcellus that Caesar had no valid argument to use against the Senate, if on or after March 1, 50 it treated the Gauls as being at its disposal.

Marcellus let his intention be known in the early months of 51, but he delayed

¹ Caesar represents himself as making this point on two occasions in 49, when he was stating his case against his enemies (*B.C.* I. 9, 2; 32, 3). Compare Cicero, *Ad Att.* VII. 7, 6, *Exercitum retinentis, cum legis dies transierit, rationem haberi placet? Mihi vero ne absentis quidem; sed cum id datum est, illud una datum est.* Apart from the obvious probability that the Caesarians had been using this argument since 52, the allusion to the *Law of the Ten Tribunes* in the *relatio* of Marcellus (Suetonius, *Diu. Iul.* 28) shows that it was being used already in 51. There is an echo of its importance in that year in the epitome of Livy, 108; *Agente in Senatu M. Marcello consule, ut Caesar ad petitionem consula-*

tus ueniret, cum is lego lata in tempus consulatus prouincias obtinere deberet.

² *Marcoque Marcello consuli finienti prouincias Gallias Kalendarum Martiarum die restituit* (cs. *Pompeius*) *Ad Att.* VIII. 3, 3. This cannot mean that Pompey withheld Marcellus on March 1, 51, for by the end of May, 51, Marcellus had not made his *relatio* (*Ad. Fam.* VIII. 1, 2), and nobody knew till September what Pompey thought about it.

³ The text here is uncertain; but clearly the meaning of what Suetonius wrote was that in the opinion of Marcellus the *Law of the Ten Tribunes* had been repealed by Pompey's *lex de iure magistratum*.

ip of 48, command hat year, . What d chosen tive pro- Senate to n that he the end of (II. 26), ions that For to Licianian- as made. Pompey had , 5), and all that ante tem- was the hope to Gauls on roved of nia Pom- be made nfirmied, March 1, inst the Tribunes r, ratio before on ense the inciarum Licinia ar. On cesarians. against posal. delayed consulatus brouncias (cs. Pom- not mean March 1, ellus had , 2), and Pompey early the that in the Ten y's lex de to put it into execution. It seems that he wished to prepare the way for a favourable reception of his *relatio*. Many senators, without being Caesarians, may have been doubtful of its legality, or of the expediency of committing the Senate to a formal declaration which might add to the difficulties of reaching a peaceful settlement, and perhaps the consul was laying private siege to the *taciturnitas* of Pompey. In May Marcellus had told Caelius that he would make his *relatio* on June 1 (*Ad Fam. VIII. 1, 2*), but in June Caelius reports, *Marcelli impetus resederunt, non inertia, sed, ut mihi videbantur, consilio* (*Ad Fam. VIII. 2, 2*). On July 22, when the business before the Senate was the payment of Pompey's troops, Pompey, *interrogatus de successione C. Caesaris*, got as far as saying that every one ought to obey the Senate (*Ad Fam. VIII. 4, 4*). He was about to start for Ariminum, and further discussion of the question was postponed until after his return in August. It seems that in August Marcellus was urging his point, but the Senate was too thinly attended to allow of any serious debate (*Ad Fam. VIII. 5, 3*). On September 1 his idea was discussed, but the Senate was not brought to a decision. *Ut video*, wrote Caelius on September 2, *causa haec integra in proximum annum transferetur*. The *causa* would be *integra* because not prejudiced by any decree of the Senate passed in 51. But that the Senate would eventually claim to dispose of the Gauls in assigning provinces in 50, Caelius had little doubt, for he went on to tell Cicero, *Et quantam diuino, relinquendus tibi erit qui prouinciam obtineat; nam non expeditur successio, quoniam Galliae, quae habent intercessorem, in eandem condicione quam ceterae prouinciae uocantur* (*Ad Fam. VIII. 9, 2*).

This passage is very important for our argument. What was this *condicio* of 'the other provinces' (the Spains, of course, being excepted)? Surely, that the Senate (if not prevented by a tribune) could dispose of them in its ordinary assignment of provinces for 50-49—the assignment in which Cicero was interested. It was in that respect that the Gauls were to be treated next year 'like other provinces.' Caelius believed, as he had believed in August (compare *Ad Fam. VIII. 5, 2*), that a Caesarian tribune would frustrate an attempt of the Senate to appoint new governors to the Gauls for 50-49, and that the result would be that no provinces at all would be assigned for that year. Compare, too, Cicero's anxious speculations on this subject in December, 51; *Ad Att. V. 20, 7* and 8.

Although in this debate of September 1 Pompey had come out with his *nullum hoc tempore senatus consultum faciendum*, he apparently said something to show that the Senate would have his support in 50; what exactly he said is uncertain owing to a corruption of the text in *Ad Fam. VIII. 9, 5*. Scipio, Pompey's father-in-law, proposed *ut Kal. Martis de prouinciis Galliis neu quid coniunctum referretur*. Probably his suggestion was that on March 1, 50, the Senate should formally declare its right to dispose of the Gauls before proceeding to the assignment of provinces. At any rate, it had a very depressing effect on Balbus.

The discussion went on, it seems, through September, until at the end of the month a decision was reached. There was to be no senatorial decree of the kind suggested by the *relatio* of Marcellus. But the Senate was now quite sure of Pompey's wish that Caesar's recall should be voted as soon as possible after the beginning of the following March.¹ And therefore on September 29 four decrees were passed, of which three were vetoed by tribunes (*Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 5-8*).²

¹ *Plane perspecta Cn. Pompei uoluntate in eam partem ut eam (sc. Caesarem) decidere post K. Martias placaret* (*Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 4*). That *post K. Martias* here refers to a time inclusive of the *Kalendarum dies*, and means 'on or after March 1,' is shown by a later passage in this letter (§ 9), where Pompey is quoted as saying, *Se ante K. Martias non posse sine iniuria de prouinciis Caesaris statuere, post K. Martias se non dubitaturum.*

This passage also shows that in § 4 *post K. Martias* is to be connected with *placaret*, not with *decidere*.

² Among the 'interceding' tribunes was C. Pansa, the well-known Caesarian and consul of 43. Nothing seems to be known about the others, C. Caelius, P. Cornelius, and L. Vinicius; it appears to be just possible that the last was *consul suffictus* in 33.

The first decree, the one which remained valid, was to the effect that the consuls of 50 *ex Kal. Martiis quae in suo magistratu futurae essent* should bring before the Senate the question of consular provinces, and that *ex Kal. Martiis* no other business should be taken before that question, nor should any other question be combined with it. This decree the Caesarian tribunes allowed to stand, for it only fixed a time at which the Senate should deal with the important routine business of deciding on the next pair of consular provinces after Syria and Cilicia.

The second decree was a declaration that any magistrate who used his official power to delay or to veto the Senate's transaction of public business in the matter of the provinces should be considered to have acted thereby *contra rem publicam*. This was vetoed as being an attempt to prejudge the action of any Caesarian magistrate of 50 who should think it advisable to interfere with the assignment of provinces.

The object of the third decree was to enable Caesar's time-expired soldiers to obtain their discharge. This of course was vetoed.

In the fourth decree the Senate declared that nine provinces—all except Syria, the Gauls, and the Spains—should be reserved for ex-praetors. That is to say, when the question of consular provinces came up, as the Spains were held by Pompey, and nine of the other provinces were to be left out of account, the provinces to be considered as available for consulars should be no more than three—the two Gauls and Syria. Naturally this decree was vetoed. And now how can we avoid the conclusion that the Senate (with the full approval of Pompey, that stickler for the observance of the Lucinian-Pompeian Law) meant to treat the Gauls as convertible into ordinary consular provinces for 50-49?¹

It is probable that the Senate was keeping Syria available for a commander of consular rank, not from any serious intention of making that province one of the two ordinary consular provinces for 50-49, but because, if the Parthian War took a grave turn, a special command might be necessary for dealing with it. Reports that the Parthians have crossed the Euphrates, wrote Caelius on November 17, *uarios sermones excitarunt: alius enim Pompeium mittendum, alius Caesarem cum suo exercitu* (one way of compromising on the question of the Gauls!), *alius consules* (*Ad Fam. VIII. 10, 2*).²

To another suggestion for settling the Gallic dispute by compromise, Caelius had alluded at the beginning of October. After saying that people now think *Pompeio cum Caesare esse negotium*, he continues, *Itaque iam, ut video, alteram utram ad condicioneum descendere uult Caesar, ut aut maneat, neque hoc anno sua ratio habeatur, aut, si designari poterit, decedat* (*Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 9*). To make *hoc anno* refer to 49 is desperate. *Hoc anno* must mean the current year from consular election to consular election; as it means in *Ad Att. VII. 8, 4*, where Cicero, writing in December, 50, says that Pompey thinks Caesar *consulatum hoc anno neglecturum*. Caelius is referring to some talk about having a law passed to enable Caesar to stand in 50 for the consulship of 49—hence the turn of phrase, *si designari poterit*. We shall see how this idea was developed in 50.

Before we leave the year 51, we must notice an incident in Gaul. In the latter

¹ How thorough and emphatic was Pompey's approval of the position which the Senate was now taking up, may be seen from *Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 9*. It is not likely that the Senate was meaning to send out in 50 more than eight ex-praetors. But the nine reserved provinces were Cilicia, Bithynia with Pontus, Asia, Macedonia, Sicily, Sardinia with Corsica, Africa, Crete, and Cyrene; and the two last could easily be combined under a single governor.

² Syria was one of the two provinces which

were declared consular in January, 49, because civil war was then breaking out, and in Cisalpine Gaul, where feeling was so strongly Caesarian, no optimate governor could win a footing, while in Syria there would be important work to do in collecting troops and money. Cisalpine Gaul was therefore assigned *pro forma* to an ex-praetor. Transalpine Gaul was given to a consular, as there was some hope of making trouble for Caesar in and through Massilia.

part
obstina
Hirtiu
univers
hoc ex
omnibu
potuiss
Canini

to take
finished
51, the
summer
dunun
their c
legion
imitat
as he
the tri
having
more
flighty
and d
recent
believ
to be
meanin

I
'the c
In Ap
as it t
future
reform
to cou
It was
very a
There
Uxell
reliqua
quo te
which
civitati
suum
aliquo
VIII.
the p
interce
he sh

V
1 W
darint,
have t

part of the summer, probably in August, some Gallic rebels were holding out obstinately in Uxellodunum against Caesar's legate Caninius. Caesar, according to Hirtius (B.G. VIII. 39), *pertinaciam [eorum] magna poena esse adficiendam iudicabat, ne universa Gallia non sibi uires defuisse ad resistendum Romanis sed constantiam putaret, neue hoc exemplo ceterae ciuitates locorum opportunitate fretae se vindicarent in libertatem, cum omnibus Gallis notum esse sciret reliquam esse unam aetatem suae prouinciae, quam si sustinere potuissent, nullum ultra periculum uerentur.* Caesar, therefore, *quam potest celerrime ad Caninium contendit.*

Now if we consider only the situation in Gaul, it surely makes far better sense to take *reliquam esse unam aetatem* as meaning 'that there was one summer left to be finished,' than to translate 'that there was one summer left to come.' If in August, 51, the Gauls had reason to think that Caesar's command would end before the next summer began, they might indeed have been encouraged by the example of Uxellodunum to hold out in strong positions for the last weeks of Caesar's last summer in their country. For some weeks the defenders of Uxellodunum had been resisting two legions; that was a *constantia* which the rest of Gaul might very well have aspired to imitate. And we can understand why Caesar hastened to Uxellodunum 'as quickly as he could.' But it makes very poor sense of the passage to read it as meaning that the tribes all over Gaul might have been encouraged (after 52!) by the prospect of having to hold their fortified places against the Romans under Caesar through one more whole summer, besides the last weeks of the present one. The Gauls were a flighty people; but that Caesar had serious apprehensions of their being widely and dangerously affected by just *that* view of the future, after their experiences in recent years, is very difficult to believe. On the other hand, it is not difficult to believe that Hirtius wrote a sentence rather clumsily, using *reliquam* for what was left to be finished, where the reader might easily slip into taking it in its more usual meaning of what was left to come.

It is plain enough that Caesar felt that the summer of 51 was indeed the last, 'the one summer left,' that he could afford to spend in operations against the Gauls. In April, 50, Caelius wrote to Cicero (*Ad Fam.* VIII. 11, 3) of the situation at Rome as it then was, *Nostri . . . ad extremum certamen rem deducere non audebant*; as to the future, *si omnibus rebus prement Curionem, Caesar defendet intercessorem; si, quod uidentur, reformidarent, Caesar quoad uoleat manebit.* This shows that in 51 Caesar must have had to count it as possible that his enemies would bring on the *extremum certamen* in 50. It was not very likely that they would do so, but they might.¹ Therefore Caesar was very anxious to have Gaul thoroughly pacified before the summer of 50 began. Therefore he was so uneasy about the effect on the Gallic mind of the resistance of Uxellodunum. Therefore, when the place surrendered, *exemplo supplici deterrendos reliquos existimauit.* *Itaque omnibus qui arma tulerant manus praecidit, uitamque concessit, quo testior esset poena improborum* (B.G. VIII. 44, 2). Therefore during the winter, which he spent among the Belgae, *unum illud propositum habebat, continere in amicitia ciuitates, nulli spem aut causam dare armorum.* *Nihil enim minus uolebat quam sub decessum suum necessitatem sibi aliquam imponi belli gerendi, ne cum exercitum deducturus esset bellum aliquod relinqueretur quod omnis Gallia libenter sine praesenti periculo susiceret* (B.G. VIII. 49). And all this is best explained if we suppose in 51 Caesar had before him the prospect that from March 1, 50, onwards there would be nothing but a tribune's *intercessio* (which might be swept away) between him and an order of the Senate that he should leave his provinces that year.

With most of the incidents of the year 50 in the *controversia Galliarum* we are not

¹ When Caelius wrote the words, *Si reformidarent, Caesar quoad uoleat manebit*, he seems to have thought it as likely (or unlikely) that the *extremum certamen* would be started in 50, as that it would come in 49.

concerned, as they are not relevant to our particular problem. That the assignment of provinces for 50-49 was prevented (as Caelius had prophesied that it would be) by the resistance of a Caesarian tribune to the Senate's attempt to dispose of the Gauls is shown by the complaint of Cicero in December, 50 (*Ad Att. VII. 7, 5*), *Senatum bonum putas per quem sine imperio prouinciae sunt? Numquam enim Curio sustinuisset si cum eo agi coeptum esset; quam sententiam senatus sequi noluit; ex quo factum est ut Caesari non succederetur.*¹

But we have to explain a passage in a letter written by Caelius towards the end of April, 50 (*Ad Fam. VIII. 11, 3*). *Quod ad rem publicam attinet, in unam causam omnis contentio coniecta est de prouinciis; in quam adhuc incubuisse cum senatu Pompeius uidetur, ut Caesar Id. Nou. decedat; Curio omnia potius subire constituit quam id pati, ceteras suas abiecit actiones. . . . Scaena rei totius haec: Pompeius, tamquam Caesarem non impugnet, sed quod illi aequum putet constitutus, ait Curionem quaerevere discordias. Valde autem non uult et plane timet Caesarem consulem designari prius quam exercitum et prouinciam tradiderit. . . . Quam quisque sententiam dixerit, in commentario est rerum urbanarum: ex quo tu quae digna sunt selige, etc.*

Caelius does not explain fully this proposal that Caesar's command should come to an end on November 13, for he is sending to Cicero a *commentarium rerum urbanarum*, in which will be found *quam quisque sententiam dixerit* in the Senate. But it is possible to fill up the lacuna in a way which presents no difficulties. It will be remembered that in October, 51, Caelius had referred to a suggestion that a law should be passed allowing Caesar to stand in 50 for the consulship of 49. It seems that in April, 50, a development of this idea had the support of Pompey and of a majority of the Senate. What was then proposed we may take to have been somewhat as follows:

1. That Caesar should be permitted, by a law of the people, to be a candidate in 50 for the consulship of 49.
2. That the consular elections should be put off till the very end of 50.
3. That Caesar might keep his command till November 13, 50; but—
4. That he must come to Rome as a *priuatus* to stand for the consulship.

By this arrangement it would have been hardly possible for the enemies of Caesar to follow up more than one of the ways open to them of bringing him to trial. But Caesar knew that one trial like Milo's would be quite enough. *Tantis rebus gestis Caius Caesar condemnatus essem.*

It remains to add that there are some other passages in Cicero's letters, written at the end of 50 or at the beginning of 49, which touch on our subject.² They have been often discussed, and little need be said of them here but that they are quite

¹ The assignment of provinces in January, 49, was extraordinary; the last decree had been passed, and the governors appointed left the city at once *paludati*, without confirmation of their *imperia* by the people (*B.C. I. 6, 5 and 6*). But this was the natural result of the Senate's decision to remove the obstacle which had prevented it in 50 from making any assignment of provinces for 50-49, and which threatened to prevent an assignment for 49-48. Before the passing of the last decree, the Senate had voted that Caesar should dismiss his army *ante certam diem* (*ib. 2, 6*)—perhaps July 1, perhaps an earlier date. Caesar said afterwards, *Doluisse se quod . . . excepto . . . semestri imperio in urbem retraheretur* (*ib. 9, 2*). Apparently, if the order to disarm had been allowed to stand, and if Caesar had complied with it, an assignment of provinces for 49-48 would have been made in the regular way.

But when that order was vetoed by Caesar's tribunes, the Senate declared a state of war, and took measures accordingly.

² *Ad Att. VII. 7, 6: Quid ergo? exercitum retinetis, cum legis dies transierit, rationem haberi placet? Mihi vero ne absentis quidem; sed cum id datum est, illud una datum est. Annorum enim decem imperium et ita latum placet? Placet igitur etiam me expulsum, etc.*

Ad Att. VII. 9, 4: Nam quid impudentius? Tenuisti prouinciam per annos decem non tibi a senatu sed a te ipso per nim et per factionem datos; praeterit tempus non legis sed libidinis tuae, fac tamen legis; ut succedatur decernitur; impeditis et ais, 'Habe meam rationem' Habe tu nostram. Exercitum tu habeas diutius quam populus iussit, innuit senatu?

Ad Att. VII. 11, 1: Honestum igitur habere exercitum nullo publico consilio, occupare urbis ciuium quo facilius sit aditus ad patriam . . . ?

consistent with our hypothesis, though they can be made to fit other hypotheses. In a letter written about December 20, 50, there is one sentence which we may notice (*Ad Att. VII. 7, 6*), because it has been treated as a serious argument for putting the end of Caesar's second *quinquennium* at March 1, 49. The sentence is, *Annorum enim decem imperium et ita latum placet?* Caesar's provincial *imperium* had already lasted for nine years, nine months, and about twenty days. For nine years, according to our hypothesis, he had held that *imperium* by the terms of two successive and, to Cicero, shocking laws; for the remaining nine months and twenty days he had been prolonging his tenure of the *imperium* so acquired. Cicero, pouring out his feelings to Atticus, expresses himself in an angry rhetorical question. There is surely no difficulty at all in supposing that he described the *imperium* of our hypothesis as *annorum decem et ita latum*.

To conclude, I would suggest that the foregoing narrative explains satisfactorily the following points:

1. The connexion between the plan for recalling Caesar and the regular assignment of provinces for 50-49—a connexion indicated by the debate and decrees of September 29, 51 (*Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 4-9*), by the words of Caelius, *quoniam Galliae . . . in eandem condicione quam ceterae provinciae vocantur* (*Ad Fam. VIII. 9, 2*), and by *Ad Fam. VIII. 5, 2, Ad Att. V. 20, 7 and 8*, and *Ad Att. VII. 7, 5*.
2. The *relatio de Caesaris provinciis* of M. Marcellus.
3. The *hoc anno* of *Ad Fam. VIII. 8, 9*.
4. The proposal that Caesar should leave his provinces on November 13.

On the other hand, all that can be said against the hypothesis on which this narrative has been founded seems to be that it requires us to assume, first, that Hirtius used the word *reliquam* rather awkwardly for 'what was left to be finished' (though it allows us to credit him with writing good sense, as the alternative interpretation of *reliquam* does not), and, secondly, that an indignant Cicero expressed himself in a letter to Atticus not with pedantic accuracy, though with substantial truth.

The belief that the *quinquennium imperii*, which was given to Caesar by the *Lex Licinia Pompeia*, came to an end on March 1, 50, seems well worth holding provisionally, till the lost books of Livy have been discovered.

C. G. STONE.

BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD.

HANDS AND SCRIBES.

IN pl. 48 of his *Facsimilés de manuscrits grecs des XV^e et XVI^e Siècles* M. Omont gives a specimen of what purports to be the hand of Valeriano Albini.¹ The MS. from which it is reproduced, Paris. gr. 1687, has at f. 158^v ταῦτην δὲ βίβλον Οὐαλερίανος Φορολιβιεὺς ὁ Ἀλβίνον Ἐνετίστι, ἐν τῷ τοῦ ἀγίου Ἀντωνίου μοναστηρίῳ ἔγραψε, ἐπη τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν . . . αφι . . . (Omont, p. 15), which might be thought warranty enough. Unfortunately MS. 2280 of the University Library of Bologna, which has the subscription ταῦτην βίβλον μετέγραψεν ὁ Οὐαλερίανος Φορολιβιεὺς ὁ Ἀλβίνον, κανονικὸς τῆς τολιτείας ἐπανομαστέντος τοῦ ἀγίου Σωτῆρος . . . ἔτει . . . χιλιοστῷ πεντακοσιοστῷ τε καὶ είκοστῷ ἐνάτῳ, is in an entirely different hand. The question, therefore, arises which, if indeed either, of these hands is that of the scribe whose name is associated with them.² The problem is complicated by the fact that the subscription of MS. Bonon. 2293, which is in the same hand as the subscription of MS. Bonon. 2280, runs thus: Φουλγέντιος Φορωλιβιεὺς ὁ Γουλιήλμον Προργενάλεωτα ταῦτην βίβλον μετέγραψεν, Ἐνετίστι ἐν κοινοβίῳ τοῦ ἀγίου Ἀντωνίου . . . ἐνιαυτῷ χιλιοστῷ πεντακοσιοστῷ τε, καὶ είκοστῷ ἐνάτῳ. . . . Bonon. 2293 was written by two scribes, the first of whom wrote ff. 1-150, the second ff. 152-184 including the subscription. As long as it was not observed that the 'Valeriano' hand of Paris. gr. 1687 and the 'Valeriano' hand of Bonon. 2280 were different from each other, it was possible to take the subscription of 2280 at its face value and to suppose that in the subscription of 2293 Valeriano was giving the name of his collaborator, Fulgenzio, who wrote ff. 1-150 (Allen, *Notes on Greek MSS. in Italy*, p. 30). Now there is no ground for making this hypothesis, for there is no more reason to accept the statement of the subscription of 2280 than the statement of the subscription of 2293, and there is an independent reason for saying that not Fulgenzio, but another, was the writer of Bonon. 2293 ff. 1-150. This person was a much more prolific producer of manuscript copies than has yet been recognized. His hand appears in the Bolognese collection in the following places: 1497, ff. 92-161^v; 2280, ff. 254-304^v; 2292, ff. 22-246; 2294, ff. 149-176^v (*Stud. It. Fil. Class. III.*, p. 401). Outside Bologna its occurrence can be recorded in Florence: Riccard. 22, 38, 43, and parts of 15, 29, 33, 41, 42 (*Stud. It. Fil. Class. II.*, p. 486); and in Oxford: Can. gr. 78, Auct. E. I. 5, ff. 69-117, 135-267, and C.C.C. 63, this last very roughly written. In none of these places is there a signature, and in fact in no place does there appear to be a signature except for his colophon in the British Museum Add. MS. 9349, where it is stated that he was Κωνσταντῖνος Μεοβότης and was writing in Padua in A.D. 1508.³ We have, therefore, three scribes, Valeriano, Fulgenzio and Constantine, and three hands, the hand of Paris. gr. 1687, the hand of the subscriptions of Bonon. 2280 and 2293, the hand of B.M. Add. 9349, but how the scribes and hands correspond to each other, and indeed, if they correspond to each other, is a matter which can be decided only by a quite different kind of evidence from what we at present possess.

E. LOBEL.

¹ The same hand is in MS. St. John's Coll. 32.

² The Bodleian MS. Auct. T. II. 12 has at f. 15 Οὐαλερίανος ὁ Ἀλβίνον κανονικὸς τῆς τολιτείας τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ταῦτην ἔγραψε βίβλον, but the hand in which this subscription and ff. 2-86 are written is, in fact, that of George Cocolus, for whose habit of taking over the subscription of his exemplar cp. Vogel-Gardthausen, p. 78, notes 5 and 6.

³ This MS. was written Λαυρεντίῳ τῷ Λιθοσιδήῳ, who seems to be Sanudo's 'Zuan Lorenzo di Saxoferrato,' professor of medicine at Padua in 1518 and the following years (Favarro, *Lo studio di Padova . . . N. Arch. Venet. N.S. XXXVI.* [1918] 113). Professor Foligno, to whom I owe this reference, also suggests that Μεοβότης is a Grecised form of the Paduan family name Mezzabati.

THE
a numb
masculin
Pathologi
Stein in
the resul
(I can
Migne, I
and this
The only
Σ 55¹ (w
θηλικά,
Goo
aīnη aīn
ζεπερος.

All

The que
χορείαις
a yard.

Two

the state

we see
MSS. B
conjectu
better) n
with the
I.T. 367,

Παρ

Παρ

The usu
'disapp
the *Iliad*

¹ It is i

² Or as

ent gives
IS. from
λερίανος
οῦ κυρίον
h. Un-
subscript-
ικδος τῆσ
φι τε καὶ
ς which,
ted with
Bonon.
ns thus:
Ἐνεργοῖ
φι ἐνάφι.
150, the
ved that
on. 2280
80 at its
wing the
on Greek
or there
the state-
ing that
s person
n recogni-
places:
(*Stud.*
orded in
lass. II.,
C.C.C.
ure, and
n in the
ορ Μετο-
scribes,
r. 1687,
d. 9349,
respond
kind of
OBEL.
φ Λιθοσ-
Lorenzo
at Padua
varo, Lo-
et. N.S.
igno, to
ests that
Paduan

MISCELLANEA II.

I.

THE least attentive Hellenist must have noticed that the Greek tongue contains a number of pairs of nouns of identical or nearly related meaning—one in the masculine, the other in the feminine. The subject attracted the notice of Lobeck, *Pathoiogia*, pp. 7 sq., *Technologia*, pp. 267 sq.; G. Meyer in Curtius' *Studien* V., p. 68; Stein in the introduction to his *Herodotus*, p. lx (on the variations in the MSS.); and the resultant list will be found in Kühner-Blass I., pp. 501, 502. It is not complete (I can add one pearl of great price: ή ἀνέμη from the *Apophthegmata patrum*, Migne, LXV. 261B;¹ and ἐν πύλῃ E 397 was taken by Aristarchus to mean ἐν πύλῃ, and this may be the origin of the three Πύλαι), and the question deserves investigation. The only doctrine that can be called such appears to be the remark in schol. BT on Σ 551 (which did not escape Lobeck), δρεπάνας] Ἰωνικῶς, οὗτοι γὰρ τρέποντι πάντα εἰς θηλυκά, τάφρη κύρτη ἀστραγάλη.

Good examples (of material things) are οἰνη οἶνος, οἴμη οἶμος τριβη-ος, χώρα χῶρος, αἰνη αἶνος, κοτύλη κότυλος, δίνη δίνος; (of immaterial) ὥρα season, ὥρος year, ἐσπέρα ἐσπέρος.

All this appears to bear on κ 8 sqq. of the children of Aeolus:

οἱ δὲ αἰεὶ παρὰ πατρὶ φίλῳ καὶ μητέρι κεδνῇ
δαίννυται· παρὰ δέ σφιν ὄνειατα μυρία κεῖται,
κνισῆν δέ τε δῶμα περιστεναχίζεται αὐλῇ
ῆματα.

The question is what αὐλῇ means. The scholia, on the right tack, say briefly χορείας ή φόραις; but the modern commentators as a rule persist in seeing in αὐλῇ αὐλή a yard. As if a house resounded in a yard,² and as if a locative were possible.

Two passages in Homer give the clue. In one, κ 456,

κλαῖον δύνρόμενοι περὶ δὲ στεναχίζετο δῶμα

the statement is self-contained. In ψ 146

τοῖσιν δὲ μέγα δῶμα περιστεναχίζετο ποσσίν

we see that the dative conveys the source of the noise. So the γράφεται of the MSS. Br V 4 αἰδή (it should have been αἰδῆ), was not so bad; and some modern conjectured αἰδῆ. Other moderns thought that αἰλῆ (*sic*, as though it were any better) might mean αἰλῆσει. But houses do not ring with verbal nouns, they resound with the flute, violin, bassoon; in other words, αὐλῇ = αὐλῆ. As Euripides has it, I.T. 367, αὐλεῖται δὲ πᾶν μέλαθρον.

II.

Παραιτεῖσθαι = ἀθετεῖν.

Παραιτοῦμαι in English means 'to deprecate, object to, put away, condemn.' The usual employment is sufficiently illustrated in Stephanus. In criticism it means 'disapprove of,' and is usually applied to forms. Here it is a mannerism of SA on the *Iliad*; e.g. B 8 Τυραννίων ὥφ' ἐν ὡς ἄπιθι· παραιτητέον δέ. E 824 Ἀρισταρχος

¹ It is in Sophocles.

² Or as if, taking περιστεναχίζεται as transitive.

παρηγήσατο τὴν ἀνὰ ἀναστρέψαι, Ο 276 παραιτητέον τοὺς διαλύνοντας τὸν ἀμοπάοντα, and sim. I 540 680 K, Λ 799, Μ 157, Ν 808, Ξ 21 183, Ο 4, Π 57, Σ 162 352, Φ 155 471, Ω 657, and possibly elsewhere, for in unindexed scholia it is difficult to be exhaustive.

We find it, however, in other scholia: *Ἁρ. Rhod. II. 127 παραιτητέον Εἰρηναῖον ἀμφανώντες γράφοντα, ΣΒκ 252 (Porphyrius) τὰς λίστες . . . τινὰς μὲν τούτων ἔγκρινομεν, τινὰς δὲ παραιτούμεθα [reject], τὰς δ' αὐτοὶ ἔξενρίσκομεν, τὰς δὲ πειρώμεθα διορθοῦν καὶ ἔξεργάζεσθαι.* Usually then applied to words themselves, or by a circumlocution to their champions, it is occasionally used of lines, and here is indistinguishable from *athetesis*.¹ *Ἁρ. Peace 854 τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἔξῆς διὰ τὸ κακέμφατόν τινες παραιτοῦνται.* Some critics condemned 854, 5, but as the MSS. of Aristophanes do not preserve critical signs we cannot tell if obeli were affixed. In the *Frogs* 1437 sqq. *ἀθετεῖ* is the word, which it should be remembered does not mean 'remove,' but 'condemn.'

In Homer we have Δ 491 (diplo) *ΣΤ' Αρισταρχος ὡς ποιητικὸν παραιτεῖται.* This must mean the verse; he could not repudiate *Λεῦκον* 'Οδυσσέως ἐσθλὸν ἐτάπρον only'.²

So when we come to B 588, which is wanting, and the obelus with it in A, and with the whole Catalogue in T, and find in ΣΑ at Γ 230 (diplo) the remark *παραιτητέον ἄρα ἔκεινον τὸν στίχον τὸν ἐν τῷ Καταλόγῳ*, and at Δ 273 (diplo) *πρὸς τοὺς ἴντοάσσοντας τοὺς Ἀθηναῖοις τὸν Τελαμώνιον*, and in ΣΒ *ad loc.* ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ οὐκ εἶχε ποιῆσαι τοῦτο, and in Strabo οὐ *παραδέχονται οἱ κριτικοί*, we cannot doubt that the expression is an equivalent of *ἀθετητέον*, to be added to *νοθεύεσθαι, ὀβελίζεσθαι*, and the like, *A.H.T. I.*, p. 111. Demosthenes XVIII. 308=246 οὐ *παραιτοῦμαι*, gl. οὐκ *ἀθετῶ*.

Moreover, Aristonicus explained diplae, he did not affix them; and as they are found affixed to Γ 230 and Δ 273, which bear upon B 558, Aristarchus knew this line. Other cases, Θ 168, I 140, are supplied by the still useful Sengebusch. The diplae and the wording of the reference reduce B 558 to the class of unoriginal lines in the vulgate. It is odd that this should have escaped Ludwich, *A.H.T. I.*, p. 223.³

T. W. ALLEN.

¹ In Sextus Empiricus (see Bekker's index) *ἀθετεῖν* and *παραιτεῖνθαι* are frequent. In at least one case (VII. 15) the latter has the same sense as the former — viz. *ἀναμένειν, ἐκβάλλειν*. An equivalent in Apollonius Dyscolus is *παραπέμπεσθαι*, 'reicio, non agnosco,' 'dismiss'; see the passages in Schneider's index.

² About A 365 Mr. Bolling is right: the subject

to *παρηγῆται* is Achilles. Similarly in Σ Birds 1216 the word is used of Iris, a character in the play. The references to the *Odyssey* were taken without verification from Dindorf's index.

³ A prophet should not seek light in vain: Ω 556 is omitted in Ε 3, Ρ 11, Β 1, Β 23; Ω 557 is not omitted at all.

THE
the Man
Differen
sented f
one who
an enth
work fo
thesis is
cism, ' t
dissertat
range o
Philosop
between
Loc
consider
authorit
Laertius
Clement
that his
work—L
had, as
sophy,' a
part of
Usener,
unavaila
Yet
produce
entirely
tradition
Atomism
sees rig
change,
thinkers
gence o
Assumin
arises ou
the void
realities
'positive
assertion
but as
phenome
mind. I
not be le
at any ra
and Man

āova, and
155 471,
hausive.
Εἰργναῖον
τὸν τούτων
πειρώμεθα
a circum-
tinguish-
tōv tives
hanes do
437 sqq.
ove,' but

u. This
only.²
n A, and
παρατη-
ποτάσ-
ε ποιήσει
xpression
the like,
etō.

new this
h. The
original
H.T. I.,

LEN.

5 Birds
ter in the
were taken
ex.

in vain:
3; Ω 557

KARL MARX ON GREEK ATOMISM.

THE first volume of the collected works of Karl Marx, which is being issued by the Marx-Engels Institute of Moscow, opens with a dissertation entitled 'Über die Differenz der demokritischen und epikureischen Naturphilosophie,' which he presented for his doctorate at the University of Jena in 1841. It is interesting to find one who was afterwards to win fame in very different fields starting his career with an enthusiastic tract on Greek philosophy, which he evidently intended to make his work for years to come; for not only does he tell us in his introduction that this thesis is a prelude to a comprehensive study of Epicureanism, Stoicism, and Scepticism, 'the philosophical basis of Roman life and character,' but appended to the dissertation are some seventy pages of preliminary notes for the larger work, which range over such varied subjects as 'The Immanent Dialectic of the Epicurean Philosophy,' 'The Idea of the "Wise Man" in Greek Philosophy,' and 'Parallels between the Epicureans, and the Pietists and Supernaturalists.'

Looking back on his work now it is almost astonishing to see how far he got considering the materials then available. He knew, of course, the main ancient authorities for Epicureanism, and the work shows a careful study of Diogenes Laertius, the Epicurean treatises of Plutarch, Cicero's dialogues, and portions of Clement of Alexandria and Sextus Empiricus. He had read Gassendi, but thought that his attempt to reconcile Epicureanism with Church tradition vitiated all his work—Marx's anti-theological bias is prominent throughout the treatise. Hegel had, as he says, published the great work 'from which dates the history of philosophy,' and Ritter in 1829, unaccompanied as yet by Preller, had issued the first part of the *History of Philosophy in Ancient Times*. But there was no Diels, no Usener, and the whole wealth of material collected from casual references was as yet unavailable, except in so far as an individual inquirer might have come across it.

Yet Marx shows a penetrating acquaintance with the two philosophers, and produces in his notes a considerable array of illustrative passages, drawn nearly entirely from the main authorities. Almost as a pioneer he rejects the ancient tradition, repeated glibly in the histories of his time, that Epicurus adopted the Atomism of Democritus wholesale, changing it here and there for the worse. He sees rightly that, although the details of the theory have not undergone a great change, except in certain important points, the real difference between the two thinkers lies in their underlying 'theory of knowledge,' and the consequent divergence of attitude in their conception of the relation of phenomena to reality. Assuming that Democritus was willing to rest content with the contradiction which arises out of the statements of the authorities that 'in reality are only the atoms and the void,' and yet 'truth lies in appearance,' Marx holds that he regarded the true realities as remote and unknowable, and devoted himself to an empirical 'search for 'positive knowledge' of the world. Epicurus, on the other hand, with his dogmatic assertion of the truth of sensation, regarded the world not as a subjective appearance, but as an objective revelation, though he was only interested in studying its phenomena in so far as a knowledge of them was necessary for the *ἀράρα* of the mind. Modern critics would be inclined to say that the position of Democritus need not be left as an unresolved antinomy, and that Epicurus had a more genuine interest at any rate in the main principles of his physics, but the contrast is in general true, and Marx was probably the first to perceive it.

Like a true Hegelian, having once got his fundamental principle, he attempts to apply it in its workings throughout the theories of the two philosophers. And here, from a modern point of view, is the weakness of the thesis. An *a priori* theory, couched in the terms of contemporary philosophy, is forced upon ancient thinkers who really approached their problems in a far simpler frame of mind. We are told that Epicurus was always conscious of the contradiction involved in his theory between the abstract conception of the atom as the 'ultimate thing' and its concrete workings as the foundation of phenomena, between the *ἀρχή* and the *στοιχεῖον*. That hence the *clinamen* is a claim to rescue the atom from the 'unindependence' of the perpendicular fall, in which it would be lost as a dot in a line; that though he had to attribute qualities to the atoms in order to account for the difference in things, he had to limit them—'not all sizes nor all shapes,' not 'absolute heaviness' but only 'different weight,' and that the crown of all his system was the account of *τὰ μετέωρα*, the heavenly bodies, in which form and matter were at last united—'atoms realized,' and realized with that fulness of independence which made it impossible to give one single explanation of their workings. For all this there is really no evidence, and it can only be constructed by much reading between the lines of the authorities. For each of these innovations of Epicurus much simpler reasons can be assigned, and are assigned in the ancient accounts, and it is clear that the explanation of the heavenly bodies is a part of his system which interested him but little and that there if anywhere he was only concerned to preserve *ἀταραχή*.

But though to-day Marx's conclusions could hardly be accepted in detail, his thesis is of real interest to a modern student of Epicureanism, firstly because it exhibits the workings of a subtle and ingenious mind in the presence of a very difficult problem, and secondly because it does call attention in a very arresting way to the real difference between Democritus and Epicurus, and to the genuine originality of the later thinker. But perhaps it is most instructive because it shows how difficult it is for a critic to approach the ancient writers except in the atmosphere of his own time, how hard to resist the temptation of reading into them his own thought and that of his contemporaries. The thesis was well worth inclusion in the volume, and any student of Epicureanism who reads it must carry away some illuminating ideas.

CYRIL BAILEY.

ΟΤΛΟΝ ΚΕΚΑΗΓΟΝΤΕΣ.

(Cf. *Class. Quart.* XIX. 210.)

THE phrase may be rendered 'uttering thick screams,' these English words bearing the same sense as in Scott, *Heart of Midlothian*, Chapter XXV.: 'She proceeded to raise the family by her screams of horror, uttered as thick as if the Brownie had been flaying her.'

R. MCKENZIE.

PRO
attention
Wind (f)
Solinum
which h
Septentr
Graece
putauit
et Aqui
Volturnu
The
(= Posic
Sal
κακίας ε
Magn. 4
that this
the prov
Fragm. A
in the
A. Gelli
Misled
proverb,
he may
mention

These v
ἡγροι and
as a trisy

The
Romans
not used
caician, c
Hesychi
make no
in Κάικο

tempts to
And here,
i theory,
thinkers
are told
is theory
concrete
v. That
e' of the
n he had
hings, he
but only
μετέωρα,
realized,'
give one
ce, and it
es. For
, and are
heavenly
e if any-

etail, his
because it
of a very
ing way
e origin-
ows how
phere of
thought
volume,
inating
AILEY.

h words
.: 'She
as if the
ENZIE.

AQUILO, THE BLACK WIND.

PROFESSOR LINDSAY [Class. Rev. XLII. (February, 1928), p. 20] has drawn attention to a Celtic parallel (*Ancient Laws of Ireland* I., p. 27) to Aquilo, the Black Wind (from *aquilus*). A less remote parallel was found by Salmasius [Plin. Exerc. in Solinum (ed. 1629), p. 1258D] in the gloss (C.G.L. III. 84. 56) *melamborus uulturnus*, on which he makes the following comment: 'Glossae nostrae nondum editae: Ἀπαρκτίας, Σεπτέντριος, Κέρκιας, Κίρκιος, Χωρὸς, Χαυρός. Eadem Glossae Volturnum μελαμβόρεαν Graece exponunt. An Volturnum quasi Volturinum idest nigrum dictum earum putauit auctor? Sed haec expositio conuenit Aquiloni, qui est μέλας βορέας, unde et Aquilo id est aquilus uentus, casco uocabulo niger.' He adds that the wind Voltumnus was really so called because it blew towards Rome from Volturnum.

The word *μελαμβόρειον* (*πνεῦμα*) occurs in Joseph. B.J. 3. 9. 3 and Strabo 4. 1. 7 (= Posidon. Fr. 90 Jacoby).

Salmasius did not fall into the error of finding a parallel relation between *κακίας* and Lat. *caecus*. He accepts (p. 1259) the opinion of Hesychius (and *Et. Magn.* 497. 49) that the wind *κακίας* was named from the river *Κάκος*. Perceiving that this cannot be upheld unless *κακίας* was pronounced *καϊκίας*, he points out that the proverb, ἔλκων ἐφ' αὐτὸν ὥστε κακίας νέφη (given in this form by Nauck, *Trag. Fragm. Adesp.* 75; cf. Kock, *Com. Adesp.* 1229), is given by an old MS. of 'Agellius' in the form ἔλκων ἐφ' αὐτὸν ὡς κακίας νέφος. Hosius' apparatus criticus to A. Gellius 2. 22 shows that more than one MS. has ἔλκων ἐφ' ἐαυτὸν ὡς κακίας νέφος. Misled (like Nauck) by the MSS. of the numerous other writers who quote the proverb, some with ὥστε, others with ὥστε, Hosius prints ὥστε. In so doing he may perhaps have been influenced by consideration of Aristoph. *Eq.* 437 (not mentioned by Salmasius), which is offered by the MSS. in the following forms:

R : ὡς οὐτοὶ ἥτοι κακίας ἡ συκοφαντίας πνεῖ.
MVA : ἥδη . . . καὶ
Γ : κακίας

These variations indicate corruption. The *ἥ* has been brought in to balance *ἥτοι*; *ἥτοι* and *ἥδη* are alternative ways of filling up the line when *κακίας* is mispronounced as a trisyllable. Aristophanes may have written:

ὥς οὐτοὶ κακίας καὶ συκοφαντίας πνεῖ.

The Latin spelling *caecias* (which Salmasius disposes of by pointing out that the Romans changed *Phaëthon* into *Phæthon*) is of questionable antiquity, and was perhaps not used before the Middle Ages. MSS. of Pliny (*H.N.* 2. 120, 121; 18. 335) have *caician*, *calcian*, *caltian*, *cancian*, and permit one to suppose that Pliny wrote *caician*. Hesychius and *Et. Magn.*, who are quoting Herodian (see *Hdn. II. 151. 15 Lentz*), make no reference to any difference between the pronunciation of *καϊκ-* in *κακίας* and in *Κάκος*.

R. MCKENZIE.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

American Journal of Philology. XLIX. 1. January-March. 1928.

G. M. Harper, *A Study in the Commercial Relations between Egypt and Syria in the Third Century before Christ*. Based on the so-called 'Zenon' papyri, which consist of letters dealing with the Syrian mission of Zenon, agent of Apollonios, the *Dioiketes* of Ptolemy II, Philadelphos; cites typical letters, dealing especially with the slave trade and the export of corn, and seeks, by references to Josephus, to establish the identity of certain persons and places mentioned. F. A. Wood, *Greek Fish Names: Part II*. Gives a list of some 120 names with meanings, and in some cases suggested etymologies. A. R. Nykl, *Brevity as a Criterion of Language*. Attacks the suitability of Ido and Esperanto as international languages on the ground that they cannot express ideas as shortly as some of the 'natural' languages—notably, English and French. L. G. Pocock, *Juvenaliana*. Deals with the following passages: VI. 589 (states that the gold necklace of the *Copa* shows that she is a Syrian); VIII. 207 (explains *aurea spira* as the ends of *redimicula* attached to the *galerus*, which is equivalent to *mitra*); X. 189 (argues that *altus* must be the correct reading, and *recto uoltu* a gloss: assumes the meaning to be 'standing on tiptoe'); XIV. 227-34 (argues against Housman's suggestions, and proposes to read: *Et qui per fraudes patrimonia conduplicari Extemplo cupiant; iuuenis sic doctus*).

XLIX. 2. April-June. 1928.

James Hulton, *The First Idyl of Moschus in Imitations to the Year 1800*. Traces the theme of 'Epos Δραπέτης' in a number of poems—Greek, Latin, Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese, German, and English. K. Scott, *The Deification of Demetrius Poliorcetes: Part I*. Suggests that the cult of the *Soteres* arose from the conception of Demetrius as the hero-founder of a city, either actually, as in the case of the new Sicyon, or metaphorically, as in the case of Athens: gives some account of the ritual of the *Demetria*, and, while discounting the suggestion (based on Plutarch's mistaken interpretation of a passage in the comedian Philippides) that the name of the Great Dionysia was ever changed to Demetria, points out certain resemblances between the worship of Dionysus and the honours paid to Demetrius. Gives details of some of the latter. F. A. Wood, *Greek Fish Names: Part III*. Concluding article of the series. Gives 134 new names, with meanings and philological illustrations. A. M. Sturtevant, *The suffix sk in Old Norse Elska*. Suggests that this is not the I.-E. *sk* suffix, but a secondary Germanic suffix, originating in verbal abstract nouns in **isk-ōn*. C. M. Hall, *Catullus LXIV. 300*. Proposes *Pindi* for the corrupt *ydri*, basing the conjecture on the association of Artemis with the Nymphs, and defending the scansion *montibus Pindi* by CXVI. 8 and XXIII. 27.

Revue de Philologie. LXXVI. 3. 1927.

A. Meillet, *Deux Notes sur les Formes grammaticales anciennes du Grec*. I. The termination of the 2nd person of the dual in the imperfect. The termination *-την* was possibly universal in Attic; it is well attested, e.g., in the MSS. of Plato. Where MSS. of Sophocles give *-τον* a short quantity is not metrically necessary, and *-την* is probably right. The evidence for Homer is not so clear, but both forms seem to have been possible. II. The inflexion of *δις* in Homer. Discusses the origin of

the var
talipedan
in his n
quantity
sideratio
existed
disentan
have dis
confused
history.
of place
Horace
the orde
compose
invented
A. Erno
edition, n
brevity o

Liter

C. E
son and
of Cyrena
Etruschi,

Mne

M. J
in Latin
language
their read
are place
moderns
Louvain,
in 1569
Atheniens
rarely pr
of the ex
now in p
accounts
work of J
that the c
fuerint, a
would be
appears in
Keil) it f
often bec
simply β
σύγκλητος
Pater Pa
a patrici
of elders.'

¹ This is
the humani

the various forms. A. Ernout, *Vaccillo ou talipedo?* Opposes the conjecture *talipedans* in *Lucr.* III. 504. There is no reason to suppose that Festus (p. 492. 22 L) in his mention of *talipedare* had Lucretius in mind. There are many variations of quantity (sometimes involving variations of spelling) in Lucretius; moreover, considerations of etymology and of analogy show that a form *vaccillo* may well have existed side by side with *uacillo*. G. Bardy, *The Thalia of Arius*. An attempt to disentangle and collect the fragments embedded in Athanasius. The work seems to have disappeared at an early date, and the evidence of Athanasius is desperately confused and obscure. The scraps which can be recovered add very little to literary history. G. Romain, *Horace : Art poétique*. I., vv. 136-152. These lines are out of place, and should be put immediately after v. 45. II. The plan of the work. Horace has ranged his ideas simply and informally, following what seemed to him the order of importance in view of the special circumstances which led him to compose the work. He did not attempt to fit the poem into a formal framework invented by rhetoricians. *Notes et Discussions* : Chiefly occupied with a review by A. Ernout of the *Oxford Terence* (Kauer and Lindsay), which he regards as a notable edition, marred in several places by excessive 'conservatism'; he also deplores the brevity of the *app. crit.*

Literis.¹ V. 1. 1925.

C. Picard on Nilsson's *Minoan-Mycenaean Religion*. G. A. S. Snijder on Anderson and Spiers, *Architecture of Ancient Rome*. F. Wiegand on Robinson's *Greek Coins of Cyrenaica*. A. H. Krappe on Kern's *Die Religion der Griechen*. A. Grenier, on *Studi Etruschi*, gives a survey of the present state of the study of Etruscan.

Mnemosyne. LV. 4. (1927.)

M. J. R. Brinkgreve, *De Vocabulorum Ordine Observationes Nonnullae*, maintains that in Latin the order of the words is not mainly fixed by usage as it is in modern languages, but is constructed by writers of the language with the object of leading their readers through a series of images, arising from the order in which the words are placed; hence writers of Latin were provided with an instrument which the moderns lack. P. C. Brouwer writes on J. van Gorp, the humanist, who studied at Louvain, migrated to Spain where he was physician to the sisters of Charles V., and in 1569 published his work *De Originibus Antverpiensis*. O. Damsté, *De Matrimonio Atheniensi*, argues that polygamy was never legally prohibited at Athens, though rarely practised for social and financial reasons. H. M. R. Leopold gives an account of the excavations recently in progress at Cumae where the cave of the Sibyl has been now in part reopened. The result has been to vindicate Virgil's description and the accounts of later authors, Pseudo-Justin and the Byzantine Agathius. L. refers to a work of J. F. Breithaupt, *Christlicher Helden Insel Malta* (Frankfurt, 1632), as evidence that the cavern was still open at that date. I. H. van Meurs, *Patres Conscripti qui fuerint*, argues that 'conscripti' in early juristic Latin does not mean enrolled which would be simply 'scripti' but 'enrolled along with . . .' Now the Roman 'senatus' appears in Polybius as *σύγκλητος*. In the Greek cities of the West (as proved by Keil) it frequently happened that Senators were co-opted for special business. These often became permanent Senators. The body which contained them was no longer simply *βουλή*, but *βουλή καὶ ἐπίκλητοι* — and hence *βουλή σύγκλητος* or simply *σύγκλητος*. On this analogy may be explained 'patres conscripti.' F. Muller, *Pater Patratus quid significet*, argues that P. P. was in most ancient times a patrician 'acting in the name of the *patres*.' Hence as *seniores* gives *senatus* 'a body of elders,' so *patres* gives *patratus* a 'body of *patres*.' So the person with whom we

¹ This is an International critical review of Lund, Sweden, the humanities, published three times a year at

are concerned was really *pater patratus*. False analogy explains the development of forms *patrāē* and *patratō* (dat. and abl.). E. H. Renkema, *De Iudicio Perduellionis sublatō*. In his *Pro Rabirio* Cicero writes 'nam de perduellionis iudicio quod a me sublatum esse criminari soles, meum crimen est, non Rabirii.' R. explains thus 'Cicero did not abolish the whole process, but he rendered invalid the condemnation by the duumvir which, according to Livy, took the form "Publi Horati, tibi perduellionem iudicio: i lictor, conliga manus." In Rabirius' case, after this formula had been pronounced, the accused was about to be put in bonds when he appealed to Cicero, who in virtue of his consular *imperium* interposed his veto. This did not affect R.'s trial before the *iudices*. G. A. S. Snyder, *De Symbolica Phaethontis Fabulae Interpretatione apud Romanos*, on certain Roman sarcophagi of the imperial age are depicted scenes illustrating the myth of Phaethon. S. regards these representations as symbols pertaining to the religion of Mithras. St. W. J. Teeuwen writes on 'The Word *Paenitentia* in Tertullian.' H. Vroom, 'Armaque' et *similia* in *Versu Hexametro Latino*. V. attempts to solve Cornu's problem—viz., words like 'armaque' very rarely occur in the 4th foot of a hexameter, and are found in the 1st far more frequently than in the 5th. Cornu thought that these phenomena are due to a difference in the 'grammatical accent' between such words as 'armaque' and (say) 'gaudia': V. thinks they arise simply from the fact that 'armaque' is a natural word for beginning a new stage in an argument; hence its appearance most often in the 1st and (less frequently) in the 5th foot. It rarely appears in the 4th, where it would normally break the verse into two halves. In 'debemur mortis nostraque' and *three other instances* the word occupying the fourth foot is closely joined to what precedes. H. Wagenvoort *Sepulcrum Incantatum* discusses the value of the tenth declamation of Quintilian as evidence for popular beliefs of that age. He appends critical notes.

Philological Quarterly (Iowa). VII. 2. 1928.

R. C. Flickinger, *On the Originality of Terence*. A criticism of G. Norwood's *Art of Terence*. Despite the rare liberties which he at times permitted himself T.'s normal practice was a close adherence to his originals.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. LXXVI. 1927. Drittes Heft.

H. von Arnim, *Die Echtheit der Grossen Ethik des Aristoteles* (continuation). A. urges that the historical allusions fit the theory of authenticity, that Theophrastus used the *Magna Moralia* as Aristotelian, and that the position of the section on pleasure confirms the view that it is the first in order of Aristotle's ethical treatises. R. Helm, *Hieronymus und Eutrop* (continuation). For the facts of Roman history which he inserted in the Chronicle Hieronymus employed a single source, but the source was not Eutropius. J. Weidgen, *Zum Thukydidestext*, II. Conjectures on Books I to III. *Miszellen*. C. Cichorius, *Zu römischen Malern*. The painting of the war of Aemilius Paullus in Liguria, mentioned *De uris illustribus* 56, is probably by L. Mallius: the name of the painter Plautius mentioned by Plin. *N.H.* 35. 115 is to be connected with M. Plautius, who administered the province of Asia at the beginning of the first century B.C.: the three artists mentioned *ib.* p. 120 can perhaps all be recognized in inscriptions. Id., *Ein Bündnisvertrag zwischen Rom und Knidos*. Dates in 45 B.C. the fragment in Täubler, *Imperium Romanum*, 450 sq. Id., *Dakische Kriegsmaschinen auf der Trajansäule*. A similar machine described by Sallust. *Hist.* III. 36 M. (ap. Nonius XIX 155), which is to be referred to the campaign of M. Lucullus against the Thracians in 73 B.C. H. Draheim, *Die Zahl der Tage in der Ilias*. On the enlargement of the Iliad from a short original. F. Marx, *Isocola puerilia*. On *Ad Herennium* IV 20, 27.

Viertes Heft.

O. Immisch, *Zu Theokrits Kyniska*. Defends the idea that an original by Sophron lies behind this idyll, and proposes in 17 βολβός τις κολχᾶς 'it was really poison.' J. Weidgen, *Zum Thukydidestext III. Notes on books IV to VI*. K. Busche, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung der Verrinen*. After a brief survey of the problem of the relations of the MSS. B. gives a number of careful notes on individual passages. E. Bickel, *Ps. Tertulliani De execrandis gentium diis*. A new text of this work, which on internal grounds is assigned to the eastern half of the Empire and to the fifth or sixth century A.D. H. Herter, *De Mutino Titino*. The history of this deity, and his supersession by Priapus: the original form of his name is Mutinus Titinus. Miszellen. E. Schwyzer, *Die 'lex regia' über den von Blitzen erschlagenen*. Regards si hominem fulminibus occisit as correct, *occisit* being used impersonally; *ne supra genua tollito* refers to burial, and rests on superstitious fear of injury in the vital centre of the body. Id., *Impomenta*. An explanation of this form, given by Paul ex Festo, p. 108. 18 M. (= 96.14 L.), and meaning 'dessert.' F. Marx, *De Galatonis tabula*. The picture by G., described by Aelian *V. H.* XIII. 22 as τὸν μὲν Ὀμηρον αὐτὸν ἐμοῦντα, τὸν δὲ ἄλλον ποιητὰς τὰ ἐμημερένα ἀρνομένους, is an allegorical representation of a stream of words proceeding from Homer's mouth and gathered in pitchers by other poets: it is not, as has been thought, a crude picture of Homer vomiting.

Rivista di Filologia. N.S. V. Fasc. 3. 1927.

A. Rostagni, *I primordi di Aristofane: IV. Il processo dell'autore e la concezione degli Acharnians*. The influence of the prosecution which followed the production of the *Babylonians*—a prosecution directed against Callistratus and not Aristophanes. Parodies of Euripides' *Telephus* in the *Acharnians*. A. Morpurgo, *Il c. 64 di Catullo*. The poem is not a mere copy from Hellenistic originals, but, in part at least, expresses the poet's personal experiences. E. Bignone, *Nuovi studi sul testo dei Pensieri di M. Aurelio*. In XII. 36 read τί σοι διαφέρει εἰ πεντ<ήκοντα καὶ ὅκτω ἡ ἑκατὸν> ἔτεσιν; and in XI. 37 ἑκατὸν ἔτεσι καὶ τὸ <πεντήκοντα καὶ> τρισὶ ταῦτα ιστορήσατ. F. Arnaldi, *Catullo e Clodia*. The Caelius of cc. 58 and 100 came from Verona and is not the orator, who belonged to Interamna Praetutiorum; but in cc. 59, 67, and 77 Rufus is probably Caelius Rufus. On the whole the evidence is rather in favour of the identification of Lesbia with Clodia. F. C. Wick, *Babaecali* (Petr. 37; Arnob. *adv. nat.* IV. 22). βαβαί, τῆς καλῆς—βαβαί, καλῆς. M. F. Pomello and P. Zancan, *Lista degli strateghi ateniesi* (432-404). The list differs from that of Beloch because it does not rest on the assumption that a general who, after the expiration of his year of office, completed the operations he had begun was necessarily re-elected. E. Albertario, *Sui testi romano-classici che annoverano l'Italia fra le provincie romane*. In Gaius III. 121a 'ceteris,' and in III. 122 the words 'nam lex . . . in ceteris prouinciis,' are intruded glosses. Miscellanea: I. G. De Sanctis, *Aedicula aerea*. Criticizes Beloch's (*Röm. Gesch.*, p. 36, n. 1) rejection of 'aeream' in Plin. *H.N.* 33, 19, comparing e.g. *Act. Ap.* 19, 24. II. A. Rostagni, *Un più completo frammento del Fenice o Ceneo di Jone di Chio*. Joins Nauck² fr. 58 to fr. 38, and the result to fr. 55. Recensioni. Note bibliografiche. G. Stefan, *Vasile Pârvan* (obituary). Pubblicazioni ricevute.

N.S. V. Fasc. 4. 1927.

R. Mondolfo, *La polemica di Zenone d'Elea contro il movimento* (to be continued). The first instalment is for the greater part a commentary on the relevant sections of *Ar. Phys.* VI. G. Coppola, *Per la storia della Commedia greca (Timocles ateniese e Difilo di Sinope. I. La commedia di Timocles*—who was the same as the tragedian of that

name. Personal and other references in the comedies, which were mainly political. With T. or one of his imitators is perhaps to be connected the 'Αγήν Σατυρικός' (Nauck², p. 810). C. Gallavotti, *Teofrasto e Aristone* (*Per la genesi dei Caratteri teofrastei*). The author of the letter abridged by Philodemus is the Stoic Ariston of Chios, and not the Peripatetic of Keos. The methods and purpose of Ariston are different from those of Thphr. in the *Characters*. G. De Sanctis, *Revisioni V. Il dominio macedonico nel Pireo*. Comments and criticisms—largely chronological—on the work of Beloch. 1. *L'arcontato di Filippo*. Defends 292/1, which B. has now accepted. 2. *L'arcontato di Polientio e Ierone*. After the Chremonidean war. 3. *La lega arcadica del III. secolo*. Ditt. Syll.² 183 is of the fourth century, and refers to the time of Epaminondas, not to a league reconstituted by Philip. 4. *Sellasia*. 222 B.C. 5. Historical problems raised by the letter of Epicurus published by Vogliano (*Rivista*, N.S. IV., p. 310 sqq.). A. Vogliano, *Nuovi testi storici*. Revised text of the letter of Epicurus, with suggestions due to Wilamowitz. M. Guarducci, *Un nuovo arconte attico: Aischines*. Shown by an inscription here published for the first time to belong to the year 106/5. This involves shifts in Kolbe's list. The identity of A. Miscellanea: I. P. Maas, *Antandros in Alceo*. Proposes to insert *Ἀντανδρός* in *P. Oxy.* 1789, fr. 6, line 5 (=Lobel, ΑΛΚΑΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΗ Α7, 5). II. A. Rostagni, *Theophrastea*. In *Char.* VI. 3 read κού προσωπεῖον ἔχων ἐν κωμικῷ χορῷ, and connect the negative with ἐν κωμικῷ χορῷ. Interpretation of *Char.* IX. 1-2, where there is no lacuna. Recensioni. Note bibliografiche. Cronache e commenti. Pubblicazioni ricevute.

Rivista di Filologia. N.S. VI. 1. 1928.

A. Rostagni, *Nuovo Callimaco I. Il prologo degli Aitia—Testo e interpretazione*. A long examination of *P. Oxy.* 2079, and Milne, *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the B.M.*, No. 181. II. *Callimaco e Apollonio Rodio*. A. is attacked in the prologue of the *Aitia*, and this is before 270. The *Hymn to Apollo* belongs to the same period. *Appendice per la storia degli Aitia*. The new fragments show that Reitzenstein (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1894, col. 225) was right in suggesting that Michael Akominatos had a text of the *Aitia*. G. De Sanctis, *Lacare*. On *P. Oxy.* 2082. I. Fr. 3 refers to 298-97. Cassander died between April and June, 297. This makes it possible to date the Macedonian kings exactly down to the end of 294. II. The light thrown by the new text on Athenian history. III. The author cannot possibly have been Phlegon. Eratosthenes is most probable. R. Mondolfo, *La polemica di Zenone contro il movimento*. Concludes the examination begun in Vol. V. pp. 433-452. M. G. Bartoli, *La monogenesi di ΘΕΟΣ e Deus*. I.-E. voiced stops were preserved in Germanic etc., but aspirated in Greek, Latin and Sanskrit when they began an accented syllable—e.g. κόρυψος but κορυφή. The normal development is to be seen, not in θέος, but in θέσ-φατος, etc. G. De Sanctis, *La Sardegna ai tempi di Costantino Pogonato*. On an inscription published by A. Taramelli in *Mediterranea* 9 (September, 1927). The Constantine of line 4 is an emperor—probably Constantine IV. Pogonatus, though a Lombard attack on Sardinia is not otherwise known in his time. The Constantine who appears as *consul* and *dux* cannot be identified, but the text is our earliest evidence for such an officer in Sardinia. Perhaps Sardinia was separated from the exarchate of Africa after the revolt of Gregory in 646. Recensioni. Note bibliografiche. Libri ricevuti.

Philologus. LXXXIII. 3. 1928.

H. E. Stier, *Nόμος Βασιλεύς*. Discusses the Greek attitude to the idea of *vόμος* as illustrated by the literature of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., with particular reference to the citations of Pindar, *Fv.* 169. J. Röhr, *Beiträge zur antiken Astro-meteorologie*. Ancient Meteorology differed from modern in crediting moon, planets,

and fixed stars, as well as the sun, with influence on the weather. R. reviews the passages bearing on this 'Astrometeorology.' J. Morr, *Poseidonios, eine Quelle Strabons im XVII. Buche*. Concludes that Artemidorus of Ephesus is S.'s main source for this book, Poseidonius being used only incidentally. F. Walter, *Zu lateinischen Schriftstellern*. Textual suggestions on: Anthologia Latina, Apuleius, Aurelius Victor, Avienus, Celsus, Cyprian, Firmicus Maternus, Fronto, Juvenal, Nepotianus, Panegyrici Latini, Paris, Sallust, Seneca, Tacitus, Valerius Maximus. Miscellaneous: E. Brandt, *Zum Aeneis-Prooemium*. Indicates grammatical difficulties in the four lines, and after comparison with imitations in the *Carm. Epigr.* concludes that they were written for a portrait of Virgil, serving as frontispiece to an edition of the *Aeneid*. C. Fries, *Adnotatiunculae criticae Tullianae*. Defends the MSS. at *Phil. V.* 18, 51 and XII. 12, 30.

LXXXIII. 4. 1928.

C. Ritter, *Was bedeutet ἀναβάλλεσθαι ἐπὶ δεξιὰ ἐλευθέρως bei Platon, Theait. 175e?* The answer is 'to keep the debate going in the proper manner,' the phrase being taken from the custom of the symposium. W. Morel, *Iologica*. An entertaining and informing article on snakes and snake-bites from Philoctetes to St. Paul, with special reference to Lucan V. 368 sqq., and illustrating from the technical writers on the subject. A. Klotz, *Zu Caes. bell. Gall. VII. 75*. Discusses the composition of the army levied by Vercingetorix. R. Zimmermann, *Die Autorschaft Tibulls an den Elegien 2-6 des IV. Buches*. From statistics of the vocabulary argues that the elegies were written by an imitator about the date of Ovid's banishment. M. Boas, *Spuren der ausservulgatischen Rezension in mittelalterlichen Catobearbeitungen*. Miscellaneous: J. Sykutris, *Solon und Soloi*. Discusses the legend connecting Solon with foundation of Soli. W. Bannier, *Zur lex Aclilia repetundarum*. Suggestions and interpretations. W. Port, *Zum Aufbau der ersten Ode des Horaz*. Argues for a two-line system. K. Münscher, *Katalepton IX. 15*. Would read, *Argium* (i.e. Adrastus) for vulgate *Phrygium*. J. Mesk, *Der Schiedsspruch in der siebenten Ekloge Vergils*. Artistic considerations forbade making one singer markedly inferior, and variety excluded the solution of Eclogue III. Hence the decision is somewhat capricious. F. Levy, *Der Weltuntergang in Senecas naturales quaestiones*. Seneca intended a dramatic counterpart to Ovid's epic treatment in the *Metamorphoses*.

Wiener Studien. 1926/27. XLV. 2.

L. Weber, *Die Attische Interpolation in Schiffskatalog*. A. Lesky, *Hellos—Hellotis*. On certain Gortynian coins which portray a fertility-goddess, worshipped in Crete in historical times as Europa, but whose older name was Hellotis. F. Schupp, *Zur Geschichte der Beweistopik in der älteren griechischen Gerichtsrede*. Discusses the Dilemma. In its origin it belongs to Philosophy rather than to Rhetoric which only developed it. J. Morr, *Xenophon und der Gedanke eines allgriechischen Eroberungszuges gegen Persien*. X. is the forerunner of Isokrates. The *Anabasis* intentionally lays stress on the wealth and weakness of Persia. A. Perkmann, *Streitzenen in der Griechisch-römischen Komödie*, II. K. Mras, *Zu Ennius*. On the proem to the Annals and the date of its composition. A. Bojkowitsch, *Hirtius als Offizier und als Stylist*. R. Holland, *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Maecenaselegien*, II. F. Walter, *Zu lateinischen Dichtern*. Emendations in Seneca, Statius and Appendix Vergiliana. MISZELLEN: Adler on Philo *περὶ μέθης*: Weymann on parallels to the 8th Eclogue: Miltner on Livy's account of Cannae: Gaheis interprets Tac. *Ann. XI. 21* as a pun made by Tiberius, *Ex se natus = Ex senatu*: Schuster on textual difficulties in Silisu Italicus: Hauler on the Orléans palimpsest of Sallust.

LANGUAGE.

Glotta. XVI. Band 3/4 Heft. 1928.

This number contains reviews of works published in 1925 (P. Kretschmer on Greek, W. Kroll on Latin, A. Nehring on Latin Grammar). F. Slotty writes on the 'sociative' and 'affective' uses of the plural of the first person in Latin, and also on the use of the subject-pronoun. He gives a detailed examination of the *plurialis auctoris*, etc., as used by Hirtius and his fellow historians of the Civil War, excluding Caesar, and deals also with Tacitus' minor works, and with the *Trinummus* of Plautus. The use or omission of *ego* is brought into connexion with the meaning and mood of the verb, and the literary or colloquial style of the passage. A. Wilhelm, in an article entitled *Tροφός*, discusses a tomb inscription from Egypt. D. Detschew in 'Bέδυ as a Macedonian deity,' argues that the Phrygian *βέδυ* properly means 'spring' 'stream,' and hence 'God of springs.' H. Krahe connects the Delian (inscr.) *Αξαντίνος Αναντίνος* with the Calabrian town Uzentum. E. Stolte writes on Faliscan personal names, giving cognates in Etruscan and Latin. We note *cauio*: Lat. *Gaius*; *neroni*: Latin *Nero*: Etr. *neru*; *scœua*: Etr. *scœva*: Lat. *Sœua*. W. Schulze discusses the spellings found on coins of the town-name Anchialos, on the Black Sea ('Ανχιαλος and Αγχιαλεων).

Indogermanische Forschungen. XLVI. (1928) 1.

W. Brandenstein, on the problem of the impersonal construction, accepts the view of older writers that impersonals are expressions for 'Existenzialurteile,' but rejects their classifications; *it* is 'deictic' or 'preparativ,' and used because it became obligatory to preface a verb with a personal pronoun. F. Sommer replies to Blümel (in I.F. 44, 249) on the accusative of specification. E. Fraenkel continues his contributions to Lithuanian grammar—the so-called 'relative' mood in O.O. in Baltic; the construction of relative clauses, dependent sentences, etc., in Lithuanian; non-thematic verb inflexion in Lith. J. Wackernagel, corrections to I.F. 45. A. Senn discusses Lith. intonation (a review of R. Ekblom's work, *Quantität u. Intonation im zentr. Hochlith.*). Book reviews.

XLVI. (1928) 2.

L. Weisgerber discusses forms of expression connected with the senses (especially smell) in Germanic (cf. Gr. -ώδης, Latin -ōsus if containing -od-: *odor*, *olere*). P. Meriggi writes a long article on pronominal and verbal forms in Lycian. A. Debrunner enumerates examples of the Skt. adverb (instrumental) *divā*, 'by day,' used as nom., subject or predicate (cf. Plaut. *appetit meridie*). *Idem*, points out that Zeno's clear recognition of the nature of Greek aspects, and his equally clear failure to recognize the true nature of the curiously called 'middle,' may be traced to the fact that his mother-speech was a Semitic tongue with aspects, and with active and passive voices, but no reflexive. H. Krahe discusses an insc. on a ring from near Scutari, presumably Illyrian *ana οεθε* (or *eθeo*?) *iser*, i.e. 'sacred to O. (E.?)', though K. suggests that *ana* is rather an adj. than a preposition. Book reviews.

Agar (T. L.)
Alexander
Allen (T. W.)
Apollo, the
Aquila, the
Athenaeus,

Bailey (C.)
Baynes (N.)
Bolling (G.)

Charlesworth
Mavis E.

Dion and the
Dodds (E.)
origin of

Forster (E.)
162 ff.

Hackforth
39 ff.
Hands and
Harward (E.)

Epistles
Hill (H.), the
Hippalus,
Historia Aenea
Housman (E.)
Hyperboraei

'illustres'
India, the

Lindsay (E.)
117 f.;
xvii. (4)
Lobel (E.)
without
202
Lowe (E.)
manuscripts
Luria (S.)

McKenzie
οδοντος κε
March 1,
Martel v
Marx, Ka
middle fo
music, G

Nock (A.)
Nutting (E.)

'One,' the
Ovid's Fa

INDICES

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

Agar (T. L.), the hymn to Hermes, 34 ff.
Alexander of Abonuteichos, 160 ff.
Allen (T. W.), *Miscellanea*, 73 ff., 203 f.
Apollo, the northern, 155 ff.
Aquilo, the Black Wind, 207
Athenaeus, *τεπι μηχανημάτων*, 64

Bailey (C.), Karl Marx on Greek Atomism, 205 ff.
Baynes (N. H.), the *Historia Augusta*, 166 ff.
Bolling (G. M.), *παπαρεῖσθαι=ἀθερεῖν* (?), 101 ff.

Charlesworth (M. P.), some notes on the *Periplus Maris Erythraei*, 92 ff.

Dion and the Platonic Epistles, 143 ff.
Dodds (E. R.), the *Parmenides* of Plato and the origin of the Neoplatonic 'One,' 130 ff.

Forster (E. S.), the pseudo-Aristotelian *Problems*, 162 ff.

Hackforth (R.), hedonism in Plato's *Protagoras*, 39 ff.
Hands and scribes, 202

Harward (J.), the Seventh and Eighth Platonic Epistles, 143 ff.
Hill (H.), the 'Equites Illustres,' 77 ff.
Hippalus, 92 ff.
Historia Augusta, the: its date and purpose, 166 ff.
Housman (A. E.), Prosody and Method (II.), 1 ff.
Hyperboreans, the offerings of the, 155 ff.
'illustres' (*ἐπιφανεῖς*), 77 ff.
India, the voyage to, 93 ff.

Lindsay (W. M.), Festus (*de verb. signif.* 284, 30), 117 f.; Terence and Scipio, 119; Martial v. xvii. (4), 191 f.
Lobel (E.), Nicander's signature, 114; questions without answers, 115 f.; hands and scribes, 202

Lowe (E. A.), more facts about our oldest Latin manuscripts, 43 ff.
Luria (S.), Zu *Pap. Oxy.* iii. (414), 176 ff.

McKenzie (R.), Aquilo, the Black Wind, 207; *οὐλον κεκλήγοντες*, 206

March 1, 50 B.C., 193 ff.

Martial v. xvii. (4), 191 f.
Marx, Karl, on Greek Atomism, 205 ff.
 middle forms of the verb in Ancient Greek, 128
 music, Greek: the Spondeion scale, 83 ff.

Nock (A. D.), Alexander of Abonuteichos, 160 ff.
Nutting (H. C.), Tacitus, *Histories* i. (13), 172 ff.

'One,' the Neoplatonic, 130 ff.
 Ovid's *Fasti*, medieval commentators on, 64

Pap. Oxy. iii. (414), 176 ff.
παπαρεῖσθαι=ἀθερεῖν (?), 101 ff.

Parmenide sof Plato and the origin of the Neoplatonic 'One,' 130 ff.

Pearson (A. C.), Sophocles' *Antigone*, 179 ff.
perduellio, 210

Pirie (J. W.), the origin of the shorter glosses of Placidus, 107 ff.
Placidus, shorter glosses of, 107 ff.

Platonic Epistles, the Seventh and Eighth, 143 ff.
 poetry, Horace and the moral function of, 65 ff.

Post (L. A.), the Vatican Plato, 11 ff.

Powell (J. U.), Callimachus and others, 113

Problems, the pseudo-Aristotelian: their nature and composition, 163 ff.
 prohibitions in Homeric Greek and Plautine Latin, 127

quid ago? quid agam?, 63

Seltman (C. T.), the offerings of the Hyperboreans, 155 ff.

Sleeman (J. H.), notes on Plotinus (II.), 28 ff.
 Sophocles' *Antigone*, notes on, 179 ff.

Stoic doctrine in Horace's views on poetry, 65 ff.

Stone (C. G.), March 1, 50 B.C., 193 ff.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS:

- Language, 126 ff., 214
- Literature and General, 63 f., 120 ff., 208
- American Journal of Philology, 63, 208
- Athenaeum (Pavia), 120
- Bulletin de la Soc. Ling. de Paris, 63
- Classical Philology, 120 ff.
- Glotta, 214
- Hermathena, 63 f.
- Hermes, 122 ff.
- Indogermanische Forschungen, 126 ff., 214
- Literis, 209
- Mnemosyne, 209 f.
- Neue Jahrbücher, 64, 124
- Philological Quarterly (Iowa), 124, 210
- Philologus, 124 f., 212 f.
- Revue de Philologie, 128, 208
- Rheinisches Museum, 125 f., 210 f.
- Rivista di Filologia, 212 f.
- Wiener Studien, 213

Tacitus, *Histories* i. (13), 172 ff.

Tate (J.), 'Imitation' in Plato's *Republic*, 16 ff.; Horace and the moral function of poetry, 65 ff.

Terpander's musical scales, 87 f.

Thomson (H. J.), Lucan, Statius, and Juvenal in the early centuries, 24 ff.

Winnington-Ingram (R. P.), the Spondeion scale, 83 ff.

II.—INDEX LOCORVM.

Acts of the Apostles viii. (24), 162

Aelian:—
V.H. iii. (4), 152; xiii. (22), 211

Aeschylus:—
Agam. (770), 180; (1383), 181
Cho. (599), 184
Prom. (330), 36

[Pseudo-]Alexander:—
In Metaph. 800. 32 (Bonitz), 138

Anth. Lat. Ries.:—
27, 9

Anth. Pal.:—
(5), 185; ix. (276), 190

Apollonius Dyscolus:—
[p. 60, Uhlig], 115

Aristophanes:—
Nub. (298), 187; (1415), 188
Pax (879), 4
Ran. (1030 ff.), 69

Aristotle:—
Metaph. 988a (10-11), 139; 1028b (21), 140
Meteor. 363a (24), 163
Pol. 1260a (35), 183
τερπι τῆς Πυθαγορικῆς φιλοσοφίας (fr. 187), 161

Athenagoras:—
Legatio pro Christianis (26), 160

Aulus Gellius:—
Noct. Att. xix. (2), 164

Ausonius:—
Moseil. (316), 3

c. *epipy.*:
986 (11), (1076), 2

Caesar:—
B.C. i. 9 (2), 200; i. 85 (9), 195
B.G. viii. 53 (1), 196

Callimachus:—
h. Del. (76), 189
(fr. 210), 183

Catullus:—
36 (13), 1, 5; 62 (222), 5; 63 (8, 9), 10; 64 (36), 6 f.; 64 (75), 6; 64 (298), 1, 3, 4 f.; 64 (324, 401, 403), 5; 67 (26), 5; 68 (65), 161; 90 (1-3), 4

Chalcidius:—
In Tim. 293 (Mullach), 138

Cicero:—
ad Att. v. 16 (4), 195; vii. 7 (5), 200; vii. 7 (6), 196, 200, 201; vii. 9 (4), 11 (1), 200; viii. 3 (3), 196

ad Fam. viii. 1 (2), 196; viii. 2 (2), 8 (4), 197; viii. 8 (9), 195, 196, 197, 198; viii. 9 (2), 197, 201; viii. 9 (5), 196, 197; viii. 10 (2), 198; viii. 11 (3), 199, 200; xv. 14 (5), 195
pro Archia (12), 70
Tusc. Disp. i. (33), 164

Clement of Alexandria:—
Pred. i. 8 (71), 132

C.I.G.:—
i. (1060), 1

C.I.L.:—
ii. (5392), iii. (2935), 9; v. (875), 79; v. (1323), vi. (135), ix. (405b), (649), 9

Ciris:—
(374), 4

Demosthenes:—
Phil. i. (9), 181
iv. (13), 184

Dio Cassius:—
xlv. (10), 81; llii. (24), 79; liv. (2), 81; liv. (3), 82; lvii. (14), lix. (10), 81; lx. (10), 77; lxxiii. (2), 98

Diodorus:—
xvi. (36), 150

Diogenes Laertius:—
vi. (82), 103

Dittenberger, O.G.I.S.:—
i. (186, 190), 94; i. (199), 97

Donatus:—
in Virg. Aen. iv. (335), 118

Epistle of James, v. (16), 161

Eudorus:—
ap. Simplicii in Phys. 181 (27 sqq.), 136

Eunapius:—
Vit. phil. (455), 130

Euripides:—
Helena (923), 179
Her. (774), 180
Hipp. (443), 186; (1274 sqq.), 184
I.T. (367), 203; (1205), 179
Med. (844), 184 f.
Orest. (428), 34
Tro. (1252), 9
(frs. 340, 388, 897), 185

Eusebius:—
H.E. xiv. (1), 168

Eustathius:—
699. (26), 962. (54), 183

Festus:—
de Verb. Signif. (146, 32), (284, 30), (442, 7), 117

G.L.K.:—
[Maecenas] vi. p. 262, 10

Herodotus:—
vii. (6), 73; viii. (59), 190

Hirtius:—
B.G. viii. (39), (44. 2), (49), 199

Homer:—
Il. iv. (130), 184; v. (696), 190; x. (8 sqq.), 203; xii. (129, 138, 178, 179a, 183a, 188a), 74; xii. (190a, 191a, 250a, 254, 255), 75; xiii. (64), 75
Od. x. (456), 203; xi. (601-4), 73; xxiii. (146), 203

Homer (contin.)
Scholia:—
ad Il.
A ad I
A ad I
T ad I
Horace:—
A.P. (9)
68; (1)
69 f.;
Carm. i.
(1), 6
7; iv.
20 ff.
Epist. i.
ii. 1 (1)
Sat. i. 3
3, 4
Hymn to H.
(349),
(371)
(392)
(407)

Isidorus:—
Orig. i.

Jerome:—
adv. R.

Josephus:—
Ant. x.

Julian:—
Or. iv.
(§ 1)
also 3
336

Livy:—
epit. (1)
Lucan:—
i. (67)
schol.
Lucian:—
Alex.

Macrobius:—
ii. 7
Martial:—
iv. 3
8
17

Martian:—
(249)

Neoptolemus
Nicander:—
Ale.
The.

Nonnus:—
44.

Numenius:—
ap.

Homer (*continued*) :—*Scholia* :—

ad Il. i. (365), 102
A ad Il. iii. (230), 103
A ad Il. viii. (56), 103
T ad Il. xii. (371), 103

Horace :—

A.P. (99-100), 67; (295 ff.), 71; (309 ff.), 68; (343-4), 67 f.; (396), 69; (401 ff.), 69 f.; (405), 70; (408 ff.), 71
Carm. i. 15 (17), 3, 7, 9; i. 19 (9), 186; i. 30 (1), 6; ii. 4 (6), 9; ii. 18 (28), 7; iii. 5 (42), 7; iv. 3 (20), 8; iv. 4 (36), 4; iv. 8 (13 ff.), 20 ff.; 9 (25 ff.), 70
Epist. i. 2 (1-4), 69; i. 2 (7), 70; i. 4 (9), 69; ii. 1 (126-131), 70
Sat. i. 3 (68), ii. 1 (2), ii. 3 (199), 4; ii. 5 (28), 3, 4

Hymn to Hermes :—

(349), 34; (357), 34 f.; (364), (365), (367), (371), (379), 35; (382), 35 f.; (385), (388), (392), (394), 36; (400), (402), (403), (405), (407), (409-15), 37; (416), 38

Isidorus :—

Orig. ix. 4 (12), 78

Jerome :—

adv. Rufin. i. (16), 24

Josephus :—

Ant. xix. (1-3), 78

Julian :—

Or. iv. (149C), 72; xviii. (§ 181), 167; xviii. (§ 190), 170 f.
also 312A-C, 313D, 334B, 334B-D, 334D-335A, 336B, 167; 343C, 171

Livy :—

epit. (108), 196

Lucan :—

i. (675), 26
scholium in Lucan. i. (1), 25

Lucian :—

Alex. (22), 161

Macrobius :—

ii. 7 (3), 172

Martial :—

iv. 39 (8), 8; v. 17 (4), 191 f.; ix. 103 (2), 2, 8; xi. 59 (1 sqq.), 173; xiv. 63. (1), 122, 173

Martianus Capella :—

(249), 6

Neoptolemus of Parium, 67

Nicander :—

Alexipharmacata (266-274), 114*Theriaca* (345-353), 114

Nonnus :—

44. (9), 189

Numenius :—

ap. Eusebii Prep. Ev. xi. (22), 132

Origen :—

(Chrysipp. *Stoic.* II. 337), 179

Ovid :—

ex Pont. iii. 1 (119), 9
Fast. ii. (620), ii. (855), 9
Her. xii. (187), 5
Met. vi. (468), 1, 3, 9; ix. (669), 7; x. (531), 1, 3, 5
Trist. v. 1 (60), 9

Pap. Oxy. :—

iii. (414), 176 ff.; xiii. (43), 10

Periplus Maris Erythraei :—

§ 19, § 23, 93; § 26, 98; § 57, 96; § 64, 93

Petronius :—

Sat. (71), 173; 131. 8. (7), 9

Philo :—

de Mose, 3. (36), 179
de opif. mundi 2. (8), 132
Leg. Alleg. ii. 1 (3), 132
quis ver. div. heres 53. (264-5), 142
Vit. contempl. I. (2), 132

Philostratus :—

Vita viii. 7 (9), 161

Plato :—

Alcib. I. (108E), 184
Apol. 31E, 189
Charmides (173), 23
[Clitopho] (408C-E, 409A), 40
Epistles (346A 7), 15; (355E), 151
Gorgias (502, 503), 22
Ion (531C), 177
Laws (667D-669B), 23; (700B), 7, 15; (719), 23; (816, 817), 19, 23; (889D), 177
Parmenides (137D-E, 138A, 139B), 132; (139E, 140B, 140D, 141A, 141B, 142A), 133; (142B-E), 138; (144B, 145A, 145B, 145E, 146A), 133
Phaedrus (248D, 248E), 22; (253B), 185; (271D), 184; (277-8), 22
Protagoras (338A), 187; (351C, 352E, 353A, 353C, 353E 5 sqq.), 41; (360A 3), 42
Republic (376E ff.), 22; (383A, 387B), 23; (388C), 17; (392C ff.), 16; (392C, 393C, 394E, 395A), 17; (396B-D, 396E, 397A), 18; (397A-C), 19; (397B, 397D), 18; (398B, 399A), 16; (400D, E), 18; (401, 402), 21; (401A), 16, 19; (401B, C), 19; (401D, 402), 16; (402B, C), 18, 19, 22, 23; (499 B, C), 23; (500, 501), 19, 21; (500C), 19; (500D ff.), 23; (505E), 42; (509B), 136; (522A, 534A), 22; (595A), 16, 19; (595C), 17; (596 ff.), 20; (596 f.), 21; (597E), 20, 21; (598B), 20, 23; (598D), 22; (598E, 599C), 23; (600E, 601A, 602A, 602B), 22; (607A), 16, 19
Symp. (210-212), 22
Theaetetus (176B), 141

Plautus :—

Cist. (407), 117
Merc. (774), 2
Rud. (604), 9
Stich. (464), 9

Pliny the Elder:—

N.H. ii. (168), 99; vi. (96-107), 94; (96), 95; (100 ff.), 96; *xxxiii.* (25), 173; (88), 63; (152), 174

Pliny the Younger:—

Ep. viii. 6 (4), 174

Plotinus:—

Enn. ii. (2. 1), (2. 3), 28; ii. (4. 8), 32; ii. (4. 14), (4. 16), 28; ii. (9. 11), 28 f.; iii. (5. 9), 33; iv. (3. 18), (4. 25), (5. 3), (5. 5), (6. 2), 29; iv. (6. 3), 29 f.; v. (1. 2), (1. 5), (2. 1), (3. 4), 30; v. (3. 10), 30 f.; v. (3. 11), 31; v. (3. 13), 31, 133; v. (3. 14), 133; v. (3. 17), 31; v. (4. 1), (5. 4), (5. 6), 133; v. (5. 9), (5. 11), 132; v. (6. 5), (7. 3), 31; v. (8. 2), 31 f.; v. (8. 10), vi. (1. 10), (1. 11), (1. 24), 32; vi. (1. 30), 32 f.; vi. (2. 11), 33; vi. (2. 15), (2. 21), 133; vi. (3. 10), 33; vi. (4. 11), 133; vi. (6. 7), (6. 10), 33; vi. (7. 8), (7. 38), 133; vi. (8. 9), 30; vi. (8. 10), 31; vi. (9. 3), 132, 133; vi. (9. 11), 142; viii. (8. 1), 32

Plutarch:—

Anton. (77), 190

cur Pythia nunc non (404A), 161

mor. 98c, 181; 241B, 190

[Pseudo-]Plutarch:—

de Musica, 1134F [Weil and Reinach, §§ 104-117], 83 f.

[§ 181], 90

Pollux:—

5. (36), 181

Polyaenus:—

Strateg. v. (4), 150

Porphyry:—

Vit. Plot. (1), 129; (10 fin.), 142

Posidonius:—

ap. Stobaei Ecl. i. 2. 29 [58H], 131

Priscian:—

G.L.K. ii. (p. 10), ii. (p. 42), 5; ii. (p. 82, 7-9), 1

Proclus:—

In Parm. (1064), 137

In Plat. Remp. (405), 72

In Tim. (54D), 136

Ptolemy:—

Harm. i. (16), 90

Seneca:—

H.F. (18), 3, 7

Tro. (246-8), 5

Servius in *Aen.* i. (382), 25; xii. (365), 26

Simplicius:—

In Phys. A 7. 230, 34 sqq. (Diels), 136; 231. (12-24), 138

Sophocles:—

Antig. (57, 68, 71, 95), 179; (110-113=127-130), 180; (241, 347 ff.), 181; (411 ff.),

Sophocles (*continued*):

181 f.; (423 ff.), 190; (575, 578 ff.), 182; (627 ff., 663-667), 183; (773 ff.), 183 f.; (782 ff.), 184; (795 ff.), 184 f.; (800), 185 f.; (839, 848, 850 ff.), 186; (855), 186 f.; (883 f., 885 ff., 966 ff., 994), 187; (1032, 1092, 1102), 188; (1123), 188 f.; (1156 f.), 189; (1301 ff.), 189 f.; (1314), 190

Trach. (582), 179

Statius:—

Silvae v. 1 (232), 7
Theb. ii. (276, 335, 339), 8; iv. (5), 78; v. 2 (12), 78; v. (78), 26; vi. (551), 8; vii. (733), 8; xii. (814, 815), 24

Strabo:—

(p. 29), 95; (p. 98), 94; (p. 118), 95; (p. 319), 187; (p. 394), 104; (p. 779), 97; (p. 798), 95

Suetonius:—

Aug. (100), 79

Gal. (14. 2), 173

Iul. (28), 196; (33), 174; (39. 2), 172

Nero (20. 3), 175

Vita Lucani, 24

Vit. (12), 172

Syrianus:—

In Metaph. 925b (27 sqq.), 136

Tacitus:—

Agric. (4), 79

Ann. ii. (59), 80; ii. (67), 97; iv. (58), 80; iv. (58. 1), 77; iv. (68), vi. (18), xi. (4), 80; xi. (35), 80, 81; xv. (28), 80; xvi. (17), 79

Hist. i. (4), 79; i. (13), 172 ff.; ii. (57. 3), 174; iv. (3. 3), 173

Terence:—

Adelphi (703), 161

Eunuch. (777), 1

Terentianus Maurus:—

(890-2), 6; (902 f.), 6

Varro:—

[*Non.* p. 49], 10;
de Ling. Lat. vii. (64), 117

Velleius Paterculus:—

ii. 88 (2), 79

Virgil:—

Georg. iv. (15), 9
scholium in Aen. ii. (445), 26

Vita Aureliani 44 (5), 168, 169

Vita Cavi (9), 168

Xenophon:—

Anab. 7. 5 (12), 187

Mem. i. iv. (1), 40

Oecon. 18 (6, 7), 182

ff.), 182;
, 183 f.;
o), 185 f.;
, 186 f.;
7; (1032,
(1156 f.),
o

78; v. 2
, 8; vii.
(p. 319),
(p. 798),
2

58), 80;
(4), 80;
i. (17),
(57. 3).

ἀδικία, ἀδίκος, 123
ἀλέω, ἀλίνειν, 127
ἀνέμη, 203
ἀπηρόα, ἀπουράς, 127
ἀπολύεσθαι, 190
ἀτίξω, 36

βάξω, βασιλεύς, 125
βέβηλος, βηλός, 127

δάρωη, 127

ἐκατηβόλος : ἐκατόν, 127
ἐξελαύνοια (Arc.), 126
ἐπάλληλος, 179
ἐπίορκος, 127
εύροντα, 127
εὗτε, εὖ τε, 127

Κασσάνδρα, 121
κάστορ : κεάζω, 127
κτῆμος : κτῆμα, 184
παραιτεῖσθαι, 203 f.
πέριξ, 189 f.

ράιδιος, ράιστώνη, 127
τάλις, 183

ὑπήνεμος, 182

*φέροια, 126
φέροιμ, φέρωμι, 126
Φίλιππος, 120
φίλος (Hom.), 127
-ώδης, 214

II. LATIN.

actio, 119
aqua, 108
cacaiae, 109
calpar, 109
castrare, 127
censere, 127
cicum, 109
cicindela, 110
cistifer, cistiber, cistophorus, 191
colurnis, 109
damium, 109
dictator, 125

experitus, 110 f.
heus, 127
impomenta, 211
-ium nouns, 127
-osus, 214
ōtium : ômentum, 127
patres conscripti, 209
susurrus, 127
(Illyrian) ana oēthe iser, 214

III. SANSKRIT AND PRE-HISTORIC.

ālīvōs (Cretan), 127
*al-nu, 127
*be(gh)-, 127
bis, bili, bil (Lyd.), 127
*darbh- (δάρωη), 127
darbhā-, 127
divā, 214

*ējōm (genit. plur.), 128
kāmas, 121
*leuḍhīos, 127
λύττος (Cretan), 127
mētros (Gortyn.) : *medhīos, 127
rōdhati, 127

śam̥s- (Vedic *śās-*), 127
simáhi = *sim imahi*, 127
śle-smilne, 127
**smei-*, 127
śn, 126

**tar̥p-* (*δάρπη*), 127
ṭṭh (Prakrit), 126
**uyā/ē-*, 127
ūpor (Cretan), 127

IV. GERMANIC.

Hamlet, 128
hazian (Gothic), 127

liudan (Gothic), 127
-ōm, -ōm (Goth. genit. plur.), 128

V.

dorob (W. Russian), 127

FROM MR. MURRAY'S LIST

THE MAKING OF LATIN

By R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester; Hon. Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 5s. net.

NEW STUDIES OF A GREAT INHERITANCE

By R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., Professor of Latin in the University of Manchester; Hon. Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. net.

VIRGIL'S MESSIANIC ECLOGUE

Its Meaning, Occasion, and Sources. Three Studies by the Rev. JOSEPH B. MAYOR, W. WARDE FOWLER, and Prof. R. S. CONWAY. With the Text of the Eclogue and a Verse Translation by Prof. R. S. CONWAY. 3s. 6d. net.

LATIN LITERATURE

By J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D., formerly Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. 5s. net.

THE ODYSSEY OF HOMER

Translated into English Verse by J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D. Vol. I. (Books I.-VIII.). Vol. II. (Books IX.-XVI.). Vol. III. (Books XVII.-XXIV.). 6s. net per volume.

ON TRANSLATING HOMER

By MATTHEW ARNOLD. With Introduction and Notes by W. H. D. ROUSE, M.A., Litt.D. 3s. 6d. net.

THE GREEK THINKERS

A History of Ancient Philosophy. By THEODOR GOMPERZ. Vol. I. translated by Laurie Magnus, M.A. Vols. II., III., and IV., translated by G. G. Berry, M.A. Four Volumes. 21s. net each.

HERODOTUS

The Text of Canon Rawlinson's Translation. With the Notes abridged for the use of Students. By A. J. GRANT, M.A., Professor of History in the University of Leeds. With Maps and Plans. Two Volumes. 18s. net.

THE ANNALS OF TACITUS

For English Readers. An English Translation with Introduction and Notes. By GEORGE G. RAMSAY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., formerly Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow. Two Volumes. 18s. net each.

THE HISTORIES OF TACITUS

An English Translation. By GEORGE G. RAMSAY, M.A., Litt.D., LL.D., formerly Professor of Humanity in the University of Glasgow. With Introduction, Frontispiece, Notes, Maps, and Index. 18s. net.

A HISTORY OF GREECE

From the Earliest Period to the Death of Alexander the Great. By GEORGE GROTE. With Portrait, Maps, and Plans. Ten Volumes. 23s. net.

ASIANIC ELEMENTS IN GREEK CIVILIZATION

The Gifford Lectures, 1915-1916

By SIR WILLIAM M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.

In this volume the author has sought to specify the contribution made by ancient Asian customs and religion to form the exquisite but short-lived flower of Hellenism, and through it to mould the civilization of the later world and of modern time. The lectures have been modified by years of further study—rather in the direction of bolder and further-reaching theory than of alteration in his original lines. 12s. net.

JOHN MURRAY, 50a, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

OXFORD BOOKS

THE ROMAN LEGIONS

By
H. M. D. Parker

15s. net

‘. . . To understand Rome without understanding her army is impossible. . . . A book like this was much needed, and it will become not only the standard work for all students of the subject, but will prove itself of interest to all who wish to understand Rome. . . .’—*Manchester Guardian*.

‘. . . Mr. Parker’s volume fills a gap in recent English studies in Roman history, and will take its place beside the late G. L. Cheesman’s admirable monograph on the auxiliary regiments. . . .’—*Scotsman*.

THE ARCHITECT OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE

By
T. Rice Holmes

15s. net

‘. . . Those who know the ROMAN REPUBLIC of Dr. Holmes need only be told that the new book is really a rather short fourth volume of the other work, in tone and texture indistinguishable, the product of minute knowledge and historical sense. . . . The book is one that scholars will wish to keep available for use. . . .’
Cambridge Review.

THE IRON AGE IN ITALY

By
D. Randall MacIver

84s. net

‘. . . This book, together with the author’s previous volume, “Villanovans and Early Etruscans,” forms a very notable accomplishment. We venture to describe it as one of the most outstanding contributions ever made to prehistoric archaeology, and certainly the most notable account of prehistory of any European area which has ever appeared in this or, indeed, any country. . . .’—*Classical Review*.

DITHYRAMB

By
A. W. Pickard-Cambridge

18s. net

‘. . . The most serious and scholarly study of the origin of Greek drama that has yet appeared in English. . . .’—*London Mercury*.

‘. . . This book is indispensable to serious students. . . .’—*Cambridge Review*.

THE OXFORD BOOK OF MEDIÆVAL LATIN VERSE

Chosen by
Stephen Gaselee

8s. 6d. net. India paper, 10s. net

‘. . . The selection is admirably representative, and the introduction and notes give exactly what is required. A charming and scholarly book. . . .’
Manchester Guardian.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
Amen House - - - E.C. 4

TK
15

